DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 498

TE 001 498

By-McGuire, George K.
The Teaching of Reading by English Teachers in Public High Schools: A National Survey. Interim Report.
Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0789
Pub Date Jun 69
Contract-OEC-5-10-029
Note-96p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.90
Descriptors-*English Instruction, Preservice Education, Reading, Reading Difficulty, Reading Improvement, *Reading Instruction, *Secondary School Teachers, Self Evaluation, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Background, *Teacher Education, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Improvement, *Teacher Responsibility, Teaching Methods
Identifiers-Project English

Focusing on the teaching of reading, this study investigated the educational preparation, teaching practices, and personal attitudes of English teachers in public high schools throughout the United States. Questionnaires were mailed to 2004 randomly selected secondary school members of the National Council of Teachers of English. Results from a 60% response indicated that (1) a large majority of teachers in the sample felt a need for teaching reading in high school and accepted this responsibility, (2) most teachers who gave reading instruction felt inadequately prepared to teach reading, (3) teachers' preparation for teaching reading has not significantly improved in recent years, and (4) better prepared teachers used more recommended reading practices and noted their own effectiveness in teaching reading more favorably than did those less well-prepared. (Author/MP)

ED031498

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-17-15-69

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

The Teaching of Reading by English Teachers in Public High Schools: A National Survey

George K. McGuire
Saint Xavier College
Chicago, Illinois

June, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TE 001 498

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY George K. McGuire
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© Copyright George K. McGuire, 1969

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

Director: J. N. Hook
Associate Director: Paul H. Jacobs
Research Associate: Raymond D. Crisp

Project Headquarters:
1210 West California
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Raymond D. Crisp, University of Illinois (non-voting member)
William H. Evans, Southern Illinois University, past member
John S. Gerrietts, Loyola University, past member and Chairman
John M. Heissler, Illinois State University, past Chairman
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois
Paul H. Jacobs, University of Illinois
Alfred L. Papillon, DePaul University, Chairman
Justus R. Pearson, Illinois Wesleyan University, past member and Chairman
Roy K. Weshinskey, Southern Illinois University, past Chairman

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Aurora College - Roy L. Crews and Ethel W. Tapper
Bradley University - W. F. Elwood and Paul Sawyer
DePaul University - Margaret M. Neville and Alfred L. Papillon
Greenville College - I. D. Baker and Donald R. Pennington
Illinois Institute of Technology - A. L. Davis and Henry C. Knepler
Illinois State University - Victor E. Gimmestad and John M. Heissler
Illinois Wesleyan University - Justus R. Pearson and Clifford Pfeltz
Knox College - Michael G. Crowell and Carl Eisemann
Loyola University - James Barry and Sister Mary Constantine
Monmouth College - Grace Boswell and Ben T. Shawver
North Central College - Richard M. Eastman and Erling Peterson
Northwestern University - Sidney Bergquist and Wallace Douglas
Olivet Nazarene College - Fordyce Bennett and Vernon T. Groves
Rockford College - William D. Baker and Ronald Podeschi
Roosevelt University - William Leppert and William Makely
Saint Xavier College - Thomas Deegan and George K. McGuire
Southern Illinois University - Ellen A. Frogner and Roy K. Weshinskey
University of Chicago - Janet A. Emig and Robert Parker
University of Illinois - J. N. Hook and Paul H. Jacobs
Western Illinois University - Alfred Lindsey, Jr. and Sherman Rush

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Harry S. Broudy, University of Illinois
Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University
Robert Bush, Stanford University
Nelson W. Francis, Brown University
Nathaniel Gage, Stanford University
Alfred H. Grommon, Stanford University
William Riley Parker, Indiana University (Deceased)
Robert C. Pooley, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Loren Reid, University of Missouri
William Sheldon, Syracuse University
James R. Squire, formerly of the University of Illinois; past Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES vi

CHAPTER

I THE PROBLEM, LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY, AND REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH 1

The Problem 1
Limitations of the Study 2
Review of Related Literature 3
    Nation-wide Studies 3
    Other Studies 11

II METHOD OF INVESTIGATION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE . 13

Overview of the Procedure 13
The Sample 14
    Method of Sampling 14
    Characteristics of the Sample 14

III ANALYSIS OF THE DATA (I) 20

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction . . . 21
Preparation for Teaching Reading 22
Has Preparation for Teaching Reading Improved? 24
Practices in Teaching Reading 27
    The Teaching of Reading Units 27
    Teaching Reading Skills in the Teaching of Literature 29
    Other Practices in the Teaching of Reading 31
    Comment on Teachers' Practices in Teaching Reading . 33
Teachers' Evaluation of Their Own Performance 34
Teachers' Evaluation of Reading Instruction in English Program 35
Responsibility for Planning Reading Instruction in English 36
Teachers' Evaluation of Developmental Reading Program in English Classes 37
Teachers' Evaluation of Remedial Reading Programs in Their Schools 38
Reading Specialists in the High Schools 41
    Number of Reading Specialists 41
    Role of Reading Specialists 41
Socio-Economic Class of Students and the Teaching of Reading 43

CHAPTER

IV ANALYSIS OF THE DATA (II): THE RELATIONSHIP OF PREPARATION TO PRACTICES AND SELF-RATINGS WITH RESPECT TO READING INSTRUCTION 45

Design of the Analysis 45
The Findings 50

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 69

Conclusions 69
Specific Recommendations 70
    Recommendations With Respect to Teacher Preparation . 70
    Recommendations for Further Research 71
Concluding Word 71

BIBLIOGRAPHY 72

APPENDIX A: The Questionnaire 74

APPENDIX B: Grouping of Responses for Use in Cross-Tabulations . 87

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Groups of Respondents 15
2. Regional Distribution of Schools in Sample and Actual Distribution in United States 17
3. Socio-Economic Class of Majority of Students in Schools of Teachers in Sample 19
4. Preparation of English Teachers for Teaching of Reading: Findings from Four Studies 25
5. Preparation (in Courses) for Teaching Reading: Less and More Experienced Teachers 26
6. Extent to Which Various Reading Units Are Taught 28
7. Teaching Reading in Context of Literature: Extent to Which Teachers Emphasize Various Skills 30
8. Emphasis on Word Study, Expansion of Vocabulary, and Increase of Speed in Reading 31
9. Frequency of Use by Teachers of Special Materials for Reading Instruction, Interest Inventories, Paperbacks, and Reading Records 32
10. Teachers' Self-Ratings with Respect to Meeting Reading Needs. 35
11. Evaluation by Respondents of Teaching of Reading by English Teachers As a Whole in Their Schools 36
12. Locus of Responsibility for Planning Reading Instruction in the English Program 36
13. Teachers' Rating of Developmental Reading Program in English Classes 37
14. Proportion of Students in First Year of School Who Are At Least Two Grade Levels Below Proper Grade Level in Reading . 39
15. Grade Level at Which Average First-Year Student in School Reads 39
16. Teachers' Evaluation of Remedial Programs in Their Schools . 40
17. Role of Reading Specialists: Extent of Responsibility for and Involvement in Various Activities 42

18. Contingency Table: Comparison of Self-Ratings of Preparation for Teaching Reading of Teachers Who Had and Teachers Who Did Not Have Reading Course 46

19a Relation of Preparation (Independent Variables A-H) to Practices and Self-Ratings 51

19b Relation of Preparation (Independent Variables I-O) to Practices and Self-Ratings 54

20. Number of Dependent Variables with Which Each Independent Variable Has Statistically Significant Relationship and Strength of Relationship As Indicated by Phi Coefficient 58

21. Number of Independent Variables with Which Each Dependent Variable Has Statistically Significant Relationship and Strength of Relationship As Indicated by Phi Coefficient 61

22. Independent and Dependent Variables Most Closely Related . . 65

I

THE PROBLEM, LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY, AND REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The Problem

The three basic questions which the present study investigated were the following: (a) To what extent do the teachers of English in the public high schools of the United States accept the teaching of reading as the responsibility of the high school and, more specifically, as their own responsibility? (b) How well prepared to teach reading do they consider themselves to be, and what has been the nature of their preparation? (c) What are their actual practices in their teaching of reading? Two further questions were investigated: (a) Has there been any improvement in their preparation in recent years? (b) Are there significant differences in actual practices in reading instruction between those teachers who have been better prepared and those who have been less well prepared?

Since at least the closing years of the first World War, reading experts have stressed time and again that the high school does have a crucially important role to play in the teaching of reading and have urged that teachers be prepared for that role. The National Council of Teachers of English has repeatedly emphasized the same theme in many of its publications, and that theme has certainly not been absent from the publications of the national organizations of teachers in other subject fields. The fact that large numbers of individual high school teachers, especially teachers of English, have accepted responsibility for instruction in reading and are striving to fulfill it is evidenced, among other ways, by the thousands of articles in which they have described their goals and their methods in reading instruction. There is similar evidence that the responsibility has been accepted by whole departments of teachers, again especially in English, and, in occasional instances, by entire high school faculties to at least some extent. Conferences on reading at the high school level have for years been well attended.

There is, then, no reason to doubt that the responsibility in question has been accepted to a degree--even to a considerable degree. Nonetheless, with respect specifically to English teachers in the high schools of the nation, it appears that only in recent years have answers to any of the questions listed above been forthcoming. Two nation-wide studies were conducted during the 1940's: one a study of secondary school reading programs, both remedial and developmental, conducted by the National Education Association in 1941; the other a study of remedial reading only, conducted by Witty and Brink in 1947. Both were valuable studies, but neither focused specifically on the role of the English teacher in reading instruction. (However, both did provide some information concerning the latter.) For many years, no other nation-wide study of reading instruction at the secondary school level appears to have been conducted. In 1963, Karlin stated, "Although there have not been any recent nation-wide surveys on the status of reading programs in high school, we do have reports of conditions in scattered areas of the country."[1] Many such reports of local programs in reading were in fact published, as were a number of surveys of high school reading programs in several states. So far as could be determined, however, studies which were both nationwide and which focused to a considerable extent on the high school English teacher's role in teaching reading have been conducted only in the present decade. These latter studies, conducted by or under the auspices of the National Council of Teachers of English, do tell us much, especially concerning the extent to which English teachers have been prepared for this particular role. To an appreciable extent, however, the questions have remained unanswered by the studies thus far conducted. The present study was intended both to supplement and to extend the research of the past. It does not, of course, provide a complete and final answer to the questions posed; even at best, no one study could.

Limitations of the Study

Although the survey instrument did include some questions about reading specialists in the school and other aspects of the total school reading program, the focus of this study was primarily on the teaching of reading by the teacher of English in the English classroom, not on the teaching of reading by special teachers in special classrooms. The study did not investigate the extent to which teachers of subjects other than English accept responsibility for teaching reading.

The most notable limitation of the study is with respect to the population from which the sample was drawn. Characteristics of that sample and the manner in which it was drawn will be described later. The point to be made now is that although the sample is a nation-wide sample in that it was drawn from a list of high school teachers of English who teach in schools throughout the United States,[2] it was not drawn from a list of all of the high school teachers of English in the United States. The list from which it was drawn was one of members of the secondary school section of the National Council of Teachers of English. The findings of the study, therefore, can be applied directly only to the population on which the sample is based--the members of the NCTE secondary school section. It seems reasonable, however, to suppose both that members of the NCTE are similar in many respects to English teachers who are not members of the NCTE and also that any differences between the two groups with respect to the teaching of reading would tend to be in favor of the NCTE group. Consequently, however bright or dark the picture indicated by the findings of this study, it is at least probable that a study based on a sample more completely representative of public high school English teachers would not present a brighter picture.

---

[1] Robert Karlin, "Nature and Scope of Developmental Reading in Secondary Schools," _Developing High School Reading Programs_, comp. Mildred A. Dawson (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1967), p. 6.

[2] See page 14.

Review of Related Literature

A. Nation-wide Studies: Although they differed from the present study in a number of respects, several nation-wide studies conducted during the past thirty years, especially several conducted during the present decade, are relevant to a consideration of the questions of this study.

1. NEA Study: Reference has already been made to this study conducted in 1941 by the National Education Association, a study of reading instruction in the secondary schools of the nation.[1] Two major differences between it and the present study are that the NEA study was not focused on English teachers and that it obtained its data for the most part from high school principals, rather than from teachers. Nevertheless, the study did throw considerable light on the extent to which (in the principals' estimation) high school teachers in general, at the same time, were accepting and fulfilling responsibility for reading instruction.

The circumstances and the purposes of the NEA study are indicated in the following statement:

> The study began with a brief inquiry on high-school reading programs, submitted in March, 1941, to all members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and to a few additional principals and headmasters of private high schools. This questionnaire asked for a general overview of the reading program: the need for reading instruction, present offerings, and an evaluation of what was being done in each school. It also requested the names and addresses of any teachers in the high school who, in the principal's opinion, were doing outstanding work in some phase of reading instruction.[2]

Replies to the questionnaire were received from 2,275 principals (there is no indication of what percent of the total this figure represents), from every state and from Hawaii (not then a state). Ninety-three percent of the respondents were principals of public schools. To the inquiry subsequently sent to the teachers who were named by the principals, there were responses from 320, of whom 303 were public school teachers and 153 were teachers of English. The inquiry asked the teacher to give "an informal and somewhat detailed report on one phase of reading instruction which...represented the highlight of his work."[3]

---

[1] Reading Instruction in Secondary Schools. Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, Vol. XX, No. 1. (Washington: Research Division of the NEA, 1942.)

[2] Ibid., p. 44.

[3] Ibid.

The report speaks of "three convincing impressions" derived from the survey as a whole:

> (a) that serious reading problems are exceedingly common in present day high schools; (b) that high school principals are awakening to the serious character of these problems; and (c) that perhaps a considerable number of high school principals are still unaware of the serious reading needs of the pupils in their schools.[1]

It states also that, according to the principals' responses, "genuine and widespread interest in reading on the part of teachers is found in relatively few schools at present."[2] The principals were speaking, however, of their teachers as a whole, not specifically of English teachers. The writer(s) (unidentified) of the NEA report state their own belief that every high-school department and every teacher have both responsibilities and opportunities to improve the reading habits and tastes of every pupil. They report, however, that the principals' responses indicated that in most schools such interest in reading as existed was exhibited only by individual teachers here and there (including special teachers of reading) or was concentrated in some one department, almost always the English department.[3] Half of the principals claimed that their schools were doing something for the most severely retarded reader, and about 40% said that attention was being given to the somewhat less serious remedial cases. Only 25% said that at least some form of systematic help in reading was being given to every pupil in their schools.[4] Reading tests were reported to be given regularly in only 41% of the public schools as a whole; however, the percentages for the junior and senior high schools were 57% and 37% respectively.[5]

The report of the NEA study states that the replies to the teacher questionnaire did not lend themselves to statistical tabulation. The report includes a long section which describes the various methods these teachers were utilizing to cope with reading needs of their pupils: methods for becoming acquainted with those needs (the teachers speak of several methods but stress that "there is no substitute for alert, discriminating observation of pupils as they actually read, both silently and orally"); providing for individual differences; selecting appropriate reading materials; improving interests and taste; improving comprehension; building vocabulary; improving reading rate; developing study skills; improving oral reading skills; providing remedial instruction. This group of teachers appears to have been both knowledgeable and devoted; clearly, if it was true, as the principals reported, that the average high school teacher was little concerned with reading instruction, this was an exceptional group. It will be recalled that they had in fact been specially selected as having done outstanding work in reading.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 8.

[2] _Ibid._

[3] _Ibid._, p. 9.

[4] _Ibid._

[5] _Ibid._, p. 11.

The report states that one common complaint of these teachers was that many principals and other administrators failed to realize the seriousness of the reading problem at the high school level and the high school's responsibility to do something about it. The report adds, not altogether convincingly, that the teachers "were not speaking of this particular group of principals."[1]

2. Witty and Brink Study:[2] In 1947, Witty and Brink conducted a study of remedial reading courses in secondary schools throughout the nation. One hundred nine schools were included in the study. Of these, 97 indicated that remedial instruction was carried on in the English department by a regular teacher who devoted at least part of his or her time to the remedial program. Thus, although the study was not begun specifically as a study of English teachers, it became so to a considerable extent. However, it differs from the present study in that it focused on the teaching of (remedial) reading in special classes, not on the teaching of reading by English teachers in their regular English classrooms.

Witty and Brink's general conclusion based on their findings is as follows:

> Although this survey shows that considerable gains are being made in organizing and developing remedial reading classes, much more comprehensive programs need to be undertaken and correlated with developmental reading programs. Unfortunately, little is being done to provide such a correlation.[3]

Their specific findings are too numerous to summarize in this review; however, one finding of special interest concerned the preparation of the teachers of the remedial reading courses. Of the total of 126 teachers, only 28 were full-time reading specialists. The others had either volunteered or been drafted for the work, even though a majority of them had had no special preparation for it.[4]

3. NCTE Study of the Continuing Education of Teachers of English: Of the several nation-wide studies, this is the most interesting in relation to the present study. It was one of a set of three studies[5] undertaken by the National

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[2] Paul Witty and William Brink, "Remedial Reading Practices in the Secondary School," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XL (April, 1949), pp. 193-205.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Two of the studies are named and discussed in the text. The third was entitled *The National Interest and the Teaching of English as a Second Language*.

Council of Teachers of English because of its concern over the neglect of English and private foundational programs of support for education in the late 1950's, following Sputnik--a neglect which the Council believed detrimental to the national interest.[1] In 1961 the NCTE published a study concerning, among other things, the amount and quality of preservice teacher education in English. This study, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, found such preservice programs to be inadequate, in some respects grievously so.[2]

The 1961 study was followed by one published in 1964, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*. It studied more intensively the preservice education of teachers of English, but, as its title indicates, it also investigated their inservice education. The study involved English as a whole, not solely reading, and it examined the preparation of both elementary and high school teachers. However, the extent to which the latter were being prepared for the teaching of reading was one of the many questions which it investigated.

In January, 1963, the directors of the study sent questionnaires to the principals of 10,000 junior and senior high schools which had been randomly selected from a list of 26,000 schools.[3] Each principal was asked to have the questionnaires completed by three "representative" teachers of English in his school. Completed questionnaires were returned by 7,417 teachers. The sample, therefore, was an unusually large one. However, the response represented only about 25% of the possible total.[4] The writers of the report recognize the possibility that the questionnaire responses may be "skewed somewhat in favor of teachers well prepared in English," and they point out that the fairly high percentage of department chairmen in the sample adds to that possibility. Therefore, they state, "however serious may seem the situation described by the survey, the report probably depicts conditions in English as more favorable than they actually are."[5] (The report also cites some evidence, however, which suggests that the group of teachers in the sample was, on the whole, a representative one.[6])

The situation described by the survey was quite sufficiently serious. The study added a considerable amount of supporting evidence to the earlier study's finding of inadequate preservice preparation for teachers of English, and it also found what it refers to as a "shocking neglect" of their inservice education by school systems.[1] Citation of its specific findings will be confined, for the most part, to those concerning the preparation of high school English teachers for the teaching of reading. Those findings were as follows:

---

[1] Committee on National Interest, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961), unnumbered page following title page.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

[3] Committee on National Interest, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1964), p. 13.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-19.

(a) Only about 10% of the teachers in the study considered themselves well prepared to teach reading. About 40% considered themselves to be moderately well prepared, and about 47% thought themselves poorly prepared. The report points out that the teachers were not asked to distinguish between preservice and inservice education and consequently they could be taken to be rating their preparation as a whole. Teachers with majors in English and teachers with a greater number of years of teaching experience tended to rate themselves as better prepared in literature, composition, and several other areas than did the non-majors and those with fewer years of experience; but no such difference obtained with respect to preparation for teaching reading.[2]

(b) A course on the teaching of reading ranked high (fourth among fourteen) in a list of courses suggested by the teachers as ones which they thought they would find of most value and interest to themselves as teachers of English. Fifty-six percent thought it would be of great value, and only 5% thought it would be of no interest or value. (A course in practical methods of teaching English was rated highest in potential value by the teachers.)[3]

(c) The study did not inquire about inservice education with respect specifically to the teaching of reading, but its findings concerning the extent to which consultant help of various kinds was available to the teachers are of some interest. More than half of the teachers (53.4%) reported that help from supervisors trained in English was never available to them.[4] Another finding, however, was that almost 40% found conferences with supervisors and principals of little help or of no help--a finding which, say the writers of the report, "awakens doubts about the quality of supervision in our schools."[5]

(d) Another finding of interest, even though not related solely to the teaching of reading, was that only about half (50.5%) of the teachers in the sample had had English as their undergraduate major.[6]

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. ix.

[2] _Ibid._, pp. 24-26.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 42.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 49.

[5] _Ibid._, p. 46-47.

[6] _Ibid._, p. 20-21.

Since the sample in this study (the one conducted by the writer) consisted of members of NCTE, it is worthwhile to note differences which the _Continuing Education_ study found to exist between the NCTE members of its sample and the sample as a whole, even though in only a few instances did the question at hand have to do specifically with reading. When the question was evaluation of the potential value of a course on the teaching of reading, the percentage (55.2%) of NCTE members who thought it would be of great value differed only slightly from the corresponding percentage (56.0%) for the sample as a whole.[1] The NCTE members, however, differed considerably from the latter in several matters. Higher percentages of them frequently attended meetings of English teachers at local, regional, state, and national levels.[2] (The differences between the percentages in each case appear to be of quite sufficient magnitude to be statistically significant, though the report does not state whether they were so.) One difference which the report itself explicitly points out as interesting is that 52.9% of the NCTE members rated the reading of professional books and periodicals as "of greatest help," whereas only 37.6% of the total sample did so.[3]

In commenting upon and making recommendations based upon the findings of the study, the writers of the report state that it is clear that both elementary and secondary school teachers of English feel less secure in teaching reading than in teaching any other part of the English program.[4] They state also that it is especially the culturally deprived students who are likely to suffer most from their teachers' deficiencies in teaching the basic language skills,[5] such as reading. Their recommendations call for concerted efforts--national, state, and local--to improve the continuing education of the English teacher.

4. _Squire and Applebee Study of High School English Instruction_:[6] The Squire and Applebee study is of considerable interest and value in relation to the present study, even though it was a study of English programs and English teachers in selected high schools of the nation, rather than in schools randomly chosen. The purpose of the study was "to identify characteristics of superior programs which might be emulated in other schools."[7] As in the _Continuing Education_ study just reviewed, reading was by no means the only focus of the study, but it did receive a good deal of the attention of the investigators.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 43.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 57.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 48.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 170.

[5] _Ibid._, p. 177.

[6] James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee, _High School English Instruction Today: The National Study of High School English Programs_ (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968).

[7] _Ibid._, p. 2.

As had Hook in an earlier study,[1] Squire and Applebee used as their basic criterion of superiority the fact that the particular school had year after year produced students who won awards in the Achievement Awards program of the NCTE. To the initial group of schools thus selected, other highly regarded high schools were added (for reasons and upon criteria unnecessary to specify here). The specific findings presented in the report concern a total group of 116 public schools,[2] located in forty-five states. The number and variety of investigative techniques and instruments used in the study are impressive.

The findings of the study concerning reading instruction in these superior schools are summarized by the authors as follows:

> The reading program on the high school level is inadequate, uncoordinated, and almost nonexistent. Although half of the schools have a reading specialist on their staffs, as part of the English department, observers could find little evidence of the effect of such specialists. Most teachers either regard reading as quite unrelated to the work which they do in the classroom or are sure that they "teach it all the time" without needing to provide any special programs or careful sequence. Few schools distinguish between the special problems of the slow reader and the needs of the average or advanced student; even fewer have made effective use of the often considerable quantity of special reading materials and mechanical aids which have been purchased in initial bursts of enthusiasm.[3]

The investigators found, in interviewing the English departments of 112 schools, that responsibility for teaching reading was definitely accepted by at least two-thirds of the departments.[4] More specific findings were as follows:

> ...only 16 of the 112 departments claimed a _great_ responsibility for the subject; only 37 claimed _some_ responsibility. Some 14 departments felt _no_ responsibility, and 33 considered the teaching of reading the obligation of a special teacher or program.[5]

---

[1] J. N. Hook, "Characteristics of Award-Winning High Schools," _English Journal_, L (January, 1961), pp. 9-15.

[2] Squire and Applebee, _op. cit._, p. 9.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 257.

[4] _Ibid._, pp. 32-33.

[5] _Ibid._, p. 153.

However, "individuals were sorely pressed to account for their exact place [i.e., the place of reading, speech, logic, and critical thinking] in the program of instruction," and teachers remarked that they had not been trained to teach reading.[1] Observers found that instruction in reading was allotted only 4.5% of the total amount of time given to various aspects of English in the classrooms of the 116 schools.[2] Instruction pertaining to mass media, which presumably would include newspapers and periodicals, received 1.3% of the total time. It is important, however, to note that by far the largest single block of time, 52.2% of the total, was devoted to literature. At several points in their text, the authors distinguish between teaching literature and teaching the reading of literature; even though teachers claimed that they "taught reading everyday" in their teaching of literature, the observers found that the skills involved in reading literature were actually being taught in few classrooms.[3]

From these and other data, the authors conclude that "the average English teacher does not consider a conscious effort to teach reading a significant aspect of the English program."[4] Interviews with ninety-nine classes of twelfth-grade students, however, indicated that the students placed improvement in the reading program fourth in a list of twelve changes they would like to see in their schools.[5]

The investigators found some exceptions, of course--classes, and in some instances even whole programs, in which analytical reading of literature was taught consciously as a process, but not in a deadening way.[6] The picture as a whole, however, was a dark one.

5. Evans and Cardone Study of English Methods Courses: A study conducted in 1962 by Evans and Cardone was in effect part of the NCTE's National Interest series of studies.[7] In reality, it was two separate but closely related studies, both of which investigated characteristics of the courses in the methods of teaching high school English in samples of the nation's colleges and universities which train teachers. This review will cite the findings which pertained, directly or indirectly, to the teaching of reading.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 153.

[2] Ibid., pp. 40-41.

[3] Ibid., pp. 107-108, 156.

[4] Ibid., p. 155.

[5] Ibid., pp. 33-36, 155.

[6] Ibid., pp. 107-108.

[7] William H. Evans and Michael J. Cardone, Specialized Courses in Methods of Teaching English (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964), pp. 1-2.

Evans found that separate courses in English methods were offered in only about two-thirds of the institutions which responded to his preliminary questionnaire.[1] (The finding of the 1961 _National Interest_ study with respect to this point was that such a course was offered in 75% of the institutions in its sample. Only 51.5% required it of English majors, and only 20.8% required it of English minors.[2]) When asked (in the Evans study) to indicate the content of the methods courses which they taught, only 30% of the instructors of these courses explicitly mentioned the teaching of reading (74% mentioned the teaching of literature).[3] They were asked also to indicate their own training and background in several areas of English and the teaching of English. With respect to the teaching of reading, only 8% indicated that they had "taken some course work"; 5% that they had "taught" it; and 28% that they had "kept informed through reading" about it.[4] Thirteen percent were members of the International Reading Association.[5]

Cardone's survey also found that the teaching of reading receives little emphasis in English methods courses, as compared with the emphasis given to the teaching of literature, composition, and language and usage. Approximately 25% of the instructors said that they gave much attention to remedial reading, 48% said they gave it some attention, and about 9% said that they gave it none (about 18% did not reply to the question). The figures with respect to teaching developmental reading are closely similar, except that the percentage who said that they gave it no attention was 17.5%.[6]

B. _Other Studies_: The foregoing five studies seem to the writer those most pertinent to his own study, inasmuch as they too were nation-wide studies and, in varying degrees, provided information concerning the teaching of reading by high school English teachers. One other nation-wide study, however, should be referred to--_the first Harvard-Carnegie Reading Study_, conducted during the 1959-60 school year by Austin and others.[7] Though devoted almost wholly to an investigation of preparation for the teaching of reading in the elementary school, it did include at least one question and one finding pertaining to reading instruction in the secondary school. Of 371 colleges and universities included in one phase of the study, only 100 offered a course on the teaching of reading in the secondary school and only 28 made the course a requirement.[1] One of the recommendations made in the report of the study is that all prospective secondary school teachers should be required to take a course in basic reading instruction.[2]

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 3.

[2] _The National Interest and the Teaching of English_, p. 7.

[3] Evans and Cardone, _op. cit._, p. 11.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 6.

[5] _Ibid._, p. 7.

[6] _Ibid._, pp. 21-22.

[7] Mary C. Austin, Coleman Morrison, and others, _The Torch Lighters: Tomorrow's Teachers of Reading_ (Cambridge: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1961).

There would no doubt be some value in surveying and summarizing studies conducted at the local level and at the state-wide level. The former especially, however, are so numerous that to review even a modest portion of them would constitute a major study in itself. Moreover, extrapolations from the local and state-wide level would remain at least somewhat dubious, and they seem to be rendered at least much less imperative by the existence of the nation-wide studies. Two regional surveys, covering more than one state, seem to the writer, however, to call for some mention.

1. Survey by Viox: This apparently unpublished study is referred to by Early.[3] Conducted in the spring of 1956, it obtained data by means of a questionnaire sent to schools in thirty-four states. Responses were received from 147 schools. Thirty-two schools indicated that reading was taught in English classes only; 19 that it was taught in both English and special reading classes; 10 that it was taught in the latter only. Eighty-six schools indicated that they had no program for reading instruction; however, some of these also indicated that reading was taught by individual teachers.[4]

2. Simmons Survey of Reading Programs in Five States: In 1963, Simmons reported a survey which he had conducted of reading programs in a random sample of secondary schools in Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the two Dakotas.[5] One hundred and twenty-seven schools participated in the study. More than a third of the schools indicated that they had no reading program at all. In most of the schools which did have a program, it appeared to be confined to remedial instruction. The study found, also, that the professional preparation of the great majority of the persons responsible for administering the programs was quite inadequate. Simmons' general conclusion is that the "findings...paint a dreary picture of today's secondary reading programs."[6] Apparently, however, the picture was somewhat brighter in English classrooms, for he says, "little purposeful reading instruction in any content area except English was reported."[7]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 117.

[2] Ibid., pp. 146-147.

[3] Margaret J. Early, "About Successful Reading Programs," English Journal, XLVI (October, 1957), pp. 395-405.

[4] Ibid., p. 399.

[5] John S. Simmons, "The Scope of the Reading Program for Secondary Schools," Reading Teacher, XVII (September, 1963), pp. 31-35.

[6] Ibid., p. 35.

[7] Ibid.

II

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

This chapter will include two parts: (a) a brief overview of the procedure followed in the study; (b) an analysis of the characteristics of sample.

Overview of the Procedure

The questionnaire used in the study went through several revisions. In the process of developing it, the writer received valuable suggestions from a number of persons, especially from Raymond D. Crisp, Paul H. Jacobs, and J. N. Hook[1]; and from Helen K. Smith,[2] who served as special consultant. The questionnaire profited also from a try-out with a small group of high school English teachers in attendance at the 1968 summer session of Saint Xavier College. (A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix A in this report.)

Copies of the questionnaire were mailed on October 30, 1968, to 2,004 members of the secondary school section of the National Council of Teachers of English. The sample was drawn by computer at the Executive Office of the NCTE in Urbana, Illinois. The procedure by which it was drawn will be described below, in the second section of this chapter. Respondents were directed to answer the questions not on the questionnaire itself but on the accompanying IBM answer sheet. To insure as much objectivity as possible in their responses, they were directed also not to sign their answer sheets. In order, however, that follow-up letters could be sent when necessary, they were asked, after completing and mailing the anonymous answer sheet, to sign and mail separately a post card which was included among the materials sent them. Receipt of the signed post card was thus a signal that the particular individual had completed and returned the answer sheet, and follow-ups were sent only to those persons from whom no such card had been received.

By the final cut-off date, in January, 1969, usable returns had been received from 912 teachers of English in public high schools. The total number of returns was considerably larger than this; but, for reasons to be explained later, it was decided that the analysis would be restricted to the returns from public school teachers. The analysis of the data from the 912 answer sheets was conducted by the Computation Center of the University of Chicago.

---

[1] Research Associate, Associate Director, and Director respectively of ISCPET.

[2] Then a member of the faculty of the Department of Education, University of Chicago; now a faculty member at the University of Illinois, Circle Campus.

The Sample

Method of Sampling

As was indicated above, the sample used in the study was drawn by computer from a list of members of the secondary school section of the NCTE. The method followed was that of systematic sampling--i.e., drawing every nth (for example, every 10th) name from a list arranged in some order. In this case, the list of NCTE secondary school members was arranged in order of postal zip code number. The number of names drawn and used as the sample was 2,004. Through a programmer's error, the sampling was discontinued before the entire list was exhausted; no names were drawn from the states of Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, and Alaska. This error was not discovered until a time when it was deemed too late to remedy it. Teachers from those four states, therefore, are not represented in this study.

Characteristics of the Sample

The NCTE list of secondary school members includes teachers in parochial and private schools as well as in public schools; and so, too, did the sample drawn for the study. The original intention was to include as part of the study a comparison between the three groups of teachers: public, parochial, and private. However, completed answer sheets from parochial and private school teachers numbered only 68 and 45 respectively. It was decided consequently, that the study would be confined to the public school teachers only.

The percentage of response to the mailing of the 2,004 questionnaires cannot be stated simply. The 912 usable returns from public school teachers represents, of course, approximately 46% of the 2,004. What percentage it is of the number of active public school teachers of English in the original sample of 2,004 cannot be known exactly. Public, parochial, and private school teachers were distributed throughout the master list from which the sample was drawn, rather than segregated in three separate groups; and the investigator was informed that it was not possible to separate out any one group. Consequently, it is possible only to estimate the exact number of public school teachers in the original sample. A further complication is that a considerable number of persons to whom questionnaires were sent responded with the information that they were no longer teachers of English.

Table 1 indicates the number of teachers in each class or group of respondents. In addition, questionnaires which were mailed to 29 persons in the sample of 2,004 were returned with the envelopes marked "Moved, left no address," "Unknown," "Forwarding expired," etc.; these persons were subtracted, therefore, from the total of 2,004 rather than classified as non-respondents. Thus the total number of respondents, 1,176 (Table 1), was 59.5% of the 1,975 persons who, presumably, did receive the questionnaire. The 912 public school teachers, upon whose returns the analysis presented in the report is based, can be safely estimated to be between 55% and 60% of the number of active public high school teachers of English included in the sample of 1,975 (the 2,004 minus the "address unknowns").

TABLE 1: GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

Group	Number
Public school teachers returning completed answer sheet	912
Parochial school teachers returning completed answer sheet	68
Private school teachers returning completed answer sheet	45
Respondents no longer teaching English	140
Respondents returning unusable answer sheets	6
Respondents returning answer sheets too late for use	5
Total	1,176

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a description of the general characteristics of the sample (the 912 teachers)--that is, the characteristics of the teachers with respect to such topics as the grade organization (7-8, 9-12, etc.) of the schools in which they teach, the enrollment in those schools, the socio-economic class of the students in the schools, and the number of years of teaching experience of the teachers.[1] The following two chapters will present the findings with respect specifically to the teaching of reading.

The copy of the questionnaire appended to this report shows the teachers' responses to each question (in percentages).[2] Detailing the responses question by question in the text would probably become tedious and even confusing; therefore, for the most part the questions are organized for treatment in meaningful groups. In the remainder of this chapter, however, the first twelve questions in the questionnaire--the ones concerning the teachers' general characteristics--are taken up one by one for the most part.

---

[1] A point to be kept in mind throughout one's reading of the entire statistical analysis in this report is that the statistics cited refer directly to teachers, not to schools. For example, the fact that 28.2% of the 912 teachers in the sample teach in school with enrollments between 500 and 1000 cannot be taken with certainty to mean that precisely 28.2% of the schools in which the respondents teach are schools with that enrollment. The reason is that it is possible that the sample may include a few cases of two or more teachers who teach in the same school. The possible differences in percentages, however, would be slight; and for the sake of brevity the analysis will include such statements as "28.2% of the schools."

[2] In the text of the report, percentages have usually been rounded off to one decimal place. In the appended questionnaire, they are extended to two decimal places.

The teachers in the sample were not asked in which particular grade they taught, but they were asked to indicate the grade organization of their school. Their answers (to Question No. 1) show that they were well distributed among junior high schools, senior highs, and junior-senior highs. Stated as percentages of the respondents who teach in schools with each type of grade organization, the distribution was as follows:

Grades 7-9 or 7-8	21.1%
Grades 7-12	13.2%
Grades 9-12	33.6%
Grades 10-12	25.1%
Some other grade organization	7.1%

The distribution of responses to Question No. 2, concerning enrollment of the schools in which the respondents teach, shows that over half teach in large schools:

Enrollment under 200	3.2%
Enrollment 200-499	10.2%
Enrollment 1000-1999	38.3%
Enrollment 999-1000	38.3%
Enrollment over 2000	20.1%

The largest single group of teachers in the sample teach in city schools. However, "city" was defined in the questionnaire rather minimally as anything over 60,000. Only about 20% teach in cities with populations over 150,000, and of these only about half in cities over 500,000. The total number of respondents teaching in rural areas and in small- and medium-sized towns was very substantial: about 46%; and over a fifth of the teachers teach in suburban schools.

As might be expected, the two largest groups of teachers in the sample teach in schools in the East and in the North-Central States.[1] The respondents were well distributed, however, over other regions of the United States. Table 2 shows the distribution in the sample and the actual distribution in the United States of public high schools (junior high schools are included in both cases).[2] (It will be recalled that Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii were not included in the study. The figure for the Far West in the first column, therefore, represents only California; in the second column it represents Oregon and Washington as well, but not Alaska and Hawaii.)

---

[1] With the exception of a specification of the states to be considered "Mid-Western," the respondents were directed to use their own judgments as to the regional classification of their states. Inclusion of a complete classification list to be followed would have lengthened the questionnaire considerably.

[2] The figures for the actual distribution are based on the number of schools in each state as given in *Digest of Educational Statistics: 1968 Edition*, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1968, p. 6. The writer has had to use his own judgment in classifying states into the various regions for the "Actual Distribution" column. To what extent the judgment of the respondents in the study coincided with his judgment is not known.

TABLE 2: REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS IN SAMPLE AND ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION IN UNITED STATES

Regions	Distribution in the Sample[1]	Actual Distribution in United States (school year 1965-66)
The East	26.7%	18.8%
The South	20.5%	23.2%
The Southwest	11.9%	14.9%
North-Central States	21.2%	22.3%
Mid-Western States	12.8%	9.1%
Mountain States	3.4%	4.4%
Far West	6.7%	7.2%

It is important to stress again that the sample for the present study was drawn not from all of the public high schools, nor even from all of the teachers of English in those schools, but from the secondary school members of the NCTE; and that consequently the sample is directly representative only of the latter. Nonetheless, as Table 2 indicates, the geographical distribution of the respondents' schools corresponds reasonably well with the actual distribution of the public high schools of the nation.

Considerably more than half of the teachers in the study have been teaching for at least seven years, and almost half of the total group have been teaching for more than ten years. Slightly less than 3% were in their first year of teaching. (Cf. Question No. 7.)

Only a tiny fraction of the respondents have less than a Bachelor's degree, and close to half of them have a Master's degree or better. The subjects in which the Master's degrees are held are split almost evenly between English and subjects other than English, with Education predominating among the latter. Only about 12% of the teachers have taken no graduate courses. Courses in English are the most frequently chosen for graduate work by those who do not have a Master's degree but who have worked beyond the Bachelor's. (Cf. Questions Nos. 8-12.)

Almost three-fourths (73.6%) of the respondents majored in English in college, and 21.9% minored in English. The Continuing Education study found that only 50.5% of its sample as a whole had an undergraduate major in English, and that 22.6%

---

[1] Percentages total slightly more than 100% because, apparently, some respondents marked more than one region.

had English as a minor. For the NCTE members in that study, the corresponding figures were 56.7% and 18.3%.[1] The Continuing Education study was conducted during the first months of 1963, about five and a half years before the present study. The difference between the findings of 56.7% and 73.6% with respect to English majors would indicate that since the time of the Continuing Education study a notable improvement has taken place--that is, that more of the teachers currently teaching in English classrooms have majored in English in college. In a study conducted in November and December of 1967, Crisp found that 76.8% of the teachers of English in secondary schools in Illinois (teachers in both public and non-public schools were included in the sample) had a college major in English and that 17.6% had an English minor.[2] He compared this finding with one from a study in 1954 in Illinois which found that 52% of the teachers surveyed reported English as their major.[3] The present study indicates that the change in this respect which is taking place in Illinois is also occurring in the nation as a whole. In addition to the finding, already cited, that 73.6% of the total sample had majored in English in college, as compared to 56.7% for NCTE members in the Continuing Education study, further evidence of a trend was found. Cross-tabulation of the question concerning number of years of teaching experience against the question concerning college majors revealed that a considerably higher percentage of those who had from one to six years of experience had majored in English than of the teachers with seven or more years of experience. The percentages are 82.4% and 68.4% respectively. The difference, tested by Chi square, is significant beyond the .001 level.[4] A further breakdown of the data showed that 85.3% of the group with one to three years of experience were English majors, as compared with 74.1% for the group with seven to ten years of experience (this difference is significant at the .02 level). In other words, in recent years it has been growing increasingly more likely that new English teachers will have majored in English in college; the number of those who do not is small and is growing smaller each year.

A final general characteristic of the sample still to be described concerns socio-economic class. The respondents were asked to indicate which one of several given socio-economic class groupings best represented the majority of students in their school.[5] Presented as the percentage of teachers who marked the various categories, the response is indicated in Table 3.

---

[1] The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English, pp. 21-22.

[2] Raymond D. Crisp, The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers (Washington: Bureau of Research, U. S. Office of Education, 1968), pp. 4, 6.

[3] Ibid., p. 29.

[4] In computations of Chi square, frequencies were used rather than percentages. The latter are cited in the report since they lend themselves better to comparisons.

[5] See Questions Nos. 45-46.

TABLE 3: SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASS OF MAJORITY OF STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS OF TEACHERS IN SAMPLE

Class	Percentage	Class	Percentage
Lower	10.1%	Combination of middle and upper	11.8%
Middle	34.0%	Combination of lower and upper	3.3%
Upper	3.6%	Combination of all three classes	24.6%
Combination of lower and middle	31.8%		

The percents add up to a disconcerting 119.2%; there can be no doubt that quite a number of respondents, contrary to instructions, marked more than one response in this pair of questions. (In all probability, the percentages for the first four groups are reliable; and hindsight suggests that the last three groups (those in the second column) would better have been combined into one inclusive group of "All others," which then would have been marked by approximately 20.5% of the respondents, inasmuch as the first four groupings account for 79.5%.[1])

---

[1] Additional confirmation of the soundness of this conjecture is given by the fact that precisely 20.56% marked response E in Question No. 45; that response is "None of these"--i.e., not any of the first four class groupings.

III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA (I)

This chapter presents the findings of the study that bear upon the first four of the five questions listed on page 1 of this report: (a) To what extent do public high school teachers of English in the U. S. accept the teaching of reading as the responsibility of the high school and, more specifically, as their own responsibility? (b) How well prepared for this task do they consider themselves to be, and what has been the nature of their preparation? (c) Has there been any improvement in their preparation in recent years? (d) What are their actual practices in teaching reading? The chapter also presents the respondents' evaluations of themselves and of the English teachers as a whole in their schools with regard to various aspects of reading instruction. The study's findings concerning several additional aspects of high school reading programs are also presented. Chapter IV presents the findings pertaining to the final question in the list: Do the actual practices in reading instruction of the better-prepared teachers differ significantly from the practices of the less well-prepared teachers?

In the questionnaire itself, Questions 13 to 100[1] (see Appendix A) may be viewed as sub-questions which pertain to the broader, more general questions and topics of the preceding paragraph. The order of the questions in the questionnaire is not the same as the order in which those broad questions are stated above, nor were all of the specific questions pertaining to one central question or topic invariably placed together in the same part of the questionnaire. In presenting the findings, therefore, it will sometimes be necessary to deviate considerably from the sequence in the questionnaire in order to draw together responses pertaining to the same central point.

---

[1] The questionnaire contained precisely one hundred questions, not because of any attribution of magic to that number, but because of a technical reason: increasing the number would have necessitated processing an additional card for each answer sheet and thus have added considerably to the cost of the study. The limitation to one hundred meant, unfortunately, that several desirable questions had to be omitted.

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction[1]

Summary of Findings

82.3% of the teachers in the sample accept the teaching of reading as a major responsibility of the high school

78.3% of them believe that this responsibility extends to developmental reading and not only to remedial reading

84.3% of them believe that all prospective high school English teachers should be required to take a course in the teaching of reading

This study offers very convincing evidence that, if it ever existed, the time has passed when high school English teachers believed that reading instruction should have been completed by the time pupils leave the elementary school. An overwhelming majority (82.3%) of the teachers in the sample disagreed with such a belief. It might be argued that, since most high school English teachers daily face students who are still reading at elementary school levels, the teachers' responses indicate merely a reluctant but realistic acceptance of the need for remedial instruction. The wording of the two questions (Nos. 38 and 39) to which they were responding, however, and the way in which they responded indicate unmistakably that they believe that the high school has responsibility also for developmental instruction in reading--i.e., for developing more advanced reading skills in high school students, beyond the level which is possible in elementary school.

The fact that the teachers accept this responsibility of the high school does not in itself, however, indicate whether and to what degree they accept it as the responsibility specifically of English teachers and as their own personal responsibility. That the large majority do accept it as incumbent upon English teachers as a whole is made most concretely evident by the fact that they believe that all prospective English teachers should be required to take a course in the teaching of reading. Personal acceptance of the responsibility is indicated by their responses to questions concerning their practices in teaching reading; they are in fact actually teaching it. More specific findings concerning their practices will be presented in a later section of this chapter.

---

[1] See responses to Questions 38, 39, and 16 in the questionnaire (Appendix A).

Preparation for Teaching Reading[1]

Summary of Chief Findings

50.8% of the teachers (68.0% of the less experienced) consider themselves poorly prepared to teach reading. Only 19.1% consider themselves well prepared.

83.5% did not receive a course on the teaching of reading at the undergraduate level.

70.2% of those who had a course in English methods indicated that the course treated the teaching of reading to little or no extent. Only 7.5% indicate that it was treated to a considerable extent.[2]

53.9% indicate that no form of inservice training in the teaching of reading has been given to the English teachers in their schools during the last five years.

83.2% of the teachers indicate that the English department in their school does not discuss the reading program of the school frequently enough to justify considering reading a major concern of the department.

76.7% indicate that such persons as reading specialists, heads of English departments, and curriculum directors give assistance only occasionally at best to individual English teachers to help them in their teaching of reading. 53.5% say that such assistance is given rarely or never, and only 17.0% indicate that it is given to at least a moderate extent specifically by a reading specialist in the school.

Clearly, whether or not the English teachers in our public high schools become well prepared to teach reading is dependent chiefly on their own efforts to prepare themselves, rather than on deliberate and systematic effort by teacher-training institutions to give appropriate preservice training or by school administrative or supervisory personnel to provide inservice training. Despite the fact that almost 85% of the teachers themselves believe that a course on the teaching of reading should be a pre-requisite for teaching high school English, such a course was required at the colleges of less than 9% of the respondents. The fact that 16.5% actually took such a course indicates that close to half of that number took the course voluntarily. About 25% had had such a course (or courses) at the graduate level. It is conceivable that, even though a teacher may not have had a separate course on the teaching of reading, he or she may have received preparation for such teaching in an English methods course. But in view of all the other topics that the latter course is likely to include, it is unlikely that reading will receive much attention; and in fact the responses of the teachers in the study reveal that rarely is it treated to any considerable extent (cf. the findings of the Evans and Cardone study with respect to this point).

---

[1] In the questionnaire (Appendix A) see especially the responses to Questions 13-29, 42, 53-54, and 88. Questions 8-12 are also pertinent.

[2] The figures in this and the next item are derived from recalculation of the percentages for Questions 18 and 21--omitting, in the first case, those who had no English methods course and, in the second, those who marked the "Do not know" response.

Inservice training of English teachers for the teaching of reading appears little better than their preservice training. When asked whether any form of inservice training in the teaching of reading had been given to English teachers in their schools within the last five years, 38.7% of the respondents indicated that it had, 45.2% that it had not, and 15.7% that they did not know (many of these, most likely, were teachers who had been at the school for less than five years).[1] The forms of inservice training which they had chiefly in mind were, apparently, demonstrations and lectures by reading specialists and teachers' work-shops and institutes. The teachers' responses to several questions (Nos. 27 and 53 especially) indicate that only a small minority of them receive much individual help in their teaching of reading from such persons as reading specialists, heads of English departments, curriculum directors, and so forth. In little over a third of the schools in which they teach is there a written description of reading instruction in the English program of the school. The percentage of English departments in which reading instruction is discussed often enough to justify considering it to be a major concern is quite small (14.4%).[2] That a very considerable proportion, however, of the teachers do attempt to improve their own preparation is suggested by the responses to two questions (Nos. 20 and 88): 45.4% have in recent years attended one or more conferences on the teaching of reading in high school (on the other hand, 52.3% have never attended such a conference); and 84.2% of them at least occasionally (45.9% more often) read articles and books about reading instruction and reports of research on reading.

On the whole, therefore, it appears that the preparation, both preservice and continuing, of the teachers for the teaching of reading has been poor. It is hardly surprising that only 5% of the sample consider themselves to be very well prepared, and only an additional 14.1% well prepared; the surprising thing is that only slightly over half consider themselves to be poorly prepared.

---

[1] In this, as in several other questions, it is worthwhile to omit the "Do not know" responses and recalculate the percentages for "Yes" and "No." In this case, recalculation yields the following percentages: "Yes": 46.1%; "No": 53.9%.

[2] This percentage is very similar to the corresponding one (14.3%) found in the Squire and Applebee study (see above, page 8) which suggests, alternatively, that in this respect superior schools are no better than other schools or that the other schools are as good as the superior.

One other point concerning the matter of preparation should be considered. It might be argued, possibly by many English teachers themselves, that English majors are better prepared to teach reading than are non-English majors--on the supposition, for example, that their subject is precisely language. As has been stated previously, 73.6% of the respondents were English majors. However, less than half (46.5%) of these rated themselves as at least fairly well prepared to teach reading, while 56.3% of the non-English majors so rated themselves.[1] In other words, the correlation between being an English major and self-rating of preparation is negative. Possible explanation of this finding will be postponed to the next chapter, in which additional comparisons of this kind will be made.

Has Preparation for Teaching Reading Improved?

When the preparation of high school English teachers for the teaching of reading is still as poor as the study reveals it to be, it seems at first sight quite academic to ask whether it is any better than it was formerly. In fact, however, the question is of great importance. As has been noted, reading experts have pleaded for years for improvement in this aspect of training programs for teachers. The *National Interest* studies of the NCTE were particularly forceful in their presentation of the crucial importance of such training; and those studies and several others, also reviewed in the first chapter of this report, presented evidence that the training was being neglected.

Table 4 compares the findings from three of the nation-wide studies which were reviewed earlier with the findings of this study concerning several of the more important aspects of the preparation. There are necessarily a number of gaps in the table because none of the other studies inquired into all of the points with which the table is concerned. It is to be recalled, also, that the finding of the *Continuing Education* study pertaining to the matter of help from supervisors referred to the teaching of English as a whole, not specifically to the teaching of reading. With respect to the column headed "Emphasis on Reading in English Methods Courses," the present study did not distinguish, as did the Evans and Cardone study, between remedial and developmental reading instruction.

The findings of the present study and of the other three studies with respect to these matters pertaining to preparation are in most respects remarkably similar. When the percentages for the ratings of "Well Prepared" and "Moderately Well Prepared" are added together in the *Continuing Education* study and in the present study, the similarity becomes even more striking--the sum being 49.9% in the former study and 49.2% in the latter. It is true, however, that the percentage of teachers in the present study who rated themselves as well prepared is almost twice that of the teachers in the *Continuing Education* study. In a set of figures which give little cause for cheer, that one difference showing some improvement may offer some encouragement, however slight. (It was not possible, however, to test the difference for statistical significance, and at least a portion of it may be due to sampling error in each study.)

---

[1] The figures given in this sentence are not given in the copy of the questionnaire in Appendix A. They were obtained by cross-tabulations of factors, such as will be discussed in the next chapter.

TABLE 4: PREPARATION OF ENGLISH TEACHERS FOR TEACHING OF READING: FINDINGS FROM FOUR STUDIES

	Teacher Self-Evaluation of Preparation			% of Colleges Requiring Reading Course	% of Teachers Reporting No Help From Supervisors	Emphasis on Reading in English Methods Courses			
	Well	Moderately Well	Poorly			Remedial: Much	Remedial: Some	Developmental: Much	Developmental: Some
		Prepared							
Continuing Education Study (1963)	10.1%	39.8%	46.9%	-	53.4%	-			
Evans and Cardone (1962)		-		-	-	24.8%	48.0%	23.6%	51.6%
Austin (1959-60)		-		7.5%	-	-			
Present Study (end of 1968)	19.1%	30.1%	50.8%	8.8%	53.5%	Considerable: 7.5% To fair extent: 22.3%			

The difference in self-rating is an objective finding; but self-rating itself is a subjective form of evaluation. It was thought that more objective evidence bearing on the question whether or not there has been improvement in preparation might be obtained by investigating whether a greater percentage of recent entrants into English teaching than of the less recent have had courses in reading or have had English methods courses in which that topic was included to a greater extent. The other nation-wide studies included no direct evidence concerning this point, but the very small difference between the two percentages in the second column of Table 4 suggested that it was unlikely that any significant difference would be found with respect to a course on reading.

To determine whether or not any such objective differences did in fact exist, the responses to several of the questions in the present study were cross-tabulated. Three such cross-tabulations were conducted. In all three, one term of the comparison was the number of years of teaching experience, while in each separate comparison the other term was, in turn, whether the respondent's college had required a course on teaching reading, whether the respondent had actually had such a course at the undergraduate level, and whether the respondent had had an English methods course (at whatever level) in which the teaching of reading had been treated to a considerable or at least to a fair extent. With respect to years of experience, only two groups were compared: those with one to three years of experience and those with seven to ten years. It was thought that comparison of those particular two groups would best indicate whether or not any improvement in preparation had taken place since the Continuing Education study, conducted in early 1963. The results of the cross-tabulations are shown in Table 5:

TABLE 5: PREPARATION (IN COURSES) FOR TEACHING READING: LESS AND MORE EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

	1 - 3 years of experience	7 - 10 years of experience
Percent of respondents in whose college course on teaching of reading was required:	13.6%	9.4%
Percent who actually had course in reading at undergraduate level:	17.5%	9.9%
Percent who had English methods course in which reading was treated to considerable or fair extent:	22.4%	23.4%

As can be seen, the differences between the two groups do, on the whole, favor the newer teachers (the figures in the bottom row would include graduate courses, which the more experienced teachers would have had more time to take--i.e., more years since graduation from college). The percentages in themselves, however, are small. Moreover, when tested by Chi square, none of the differences is statistically significant. In other words, with respect to these forms of preparation, new English teachers (most of whom at least would probably be new graduates) are not being better prepared at the undergraduate level for the teaching of reading.

In order to determine whether more of the newer teachers than of the experienced teachers considered themselves to be well prepared, another cross-tabulation was conducted. In this case, the total sample was split into two groups: those with one to six years of experience and those with seven or more. The three categories (in the questionnaire) of "very well prepared," "well prepared," and "fairly well prepared" were combined into one; and the two categories of "rather poorly prepared" and "very poorly prepared" were also combined. In this comparison, it was found that the more experienced group rated themselves more favorably. Fifty-nine percent (59.1%) of those with seven or more years of experience rated themselves as well prepared (when the categories were combined as indicated), while only 32.0% of those with one to six years did so. (This means, of course, that 68% of the latter group rated themselves as poorly prepared.)

The difference between the two groups, tested by Chi square, is significant beyond the .001 level. This finding is not at all surprising, since in fact, as we have just seen, the newer teachers are not receiving better preservice preparation, and the teachers who have been teaching for more years have had more time to receive whatever inservice training is available and simply to learn from their own experiences in teaching reading.

Analysis, then, of data from this study itself as well as comparison of its findings with those of former studies indicates that no improvement has taken place in the preparation of English teachers for reading instruction, despite the strong and urgent recommendations thereto that have been made for some years.

Practices in Teaching Reading

What is meant by the term "practices" in this report can most easily be made clear by reference to the pertinent questions in the questionnaire. These are chiefly the group of questions from No. 64 to the end. The first set of questions in this group asked the respondent, first, whether various kinds of units[1] were taught as part of the reading component of the English program as a whole in his or her school; and, second, whether or not the individual respondent had taught each of the various units one or more times during the last five years. The questions asked, in turn, about the teaching of units on the reading of newspaper and periodicals, propaganda analysis and the study of advertisements, semantics, critical reading of non-fiction prose, and methods of reading for purposes of study; and then about the extent to which the English program as a whole and the individual respondent placed emphasis on word study, expansion of vocabulary, and the increasing of speed in reading. Further questions involved instruction concerning the use of the library; and the extent to which the respondent made use of materials specifically designed for the development of reading skills, use of reading inventories, use of paperbacks, and use of reading records. The final set of (twelve) questions asked to what extent in the teaching of literature the individual respondent attempted deliberately and systematically (the last three words were underlined in the questionnaire) to develop various abilities and understandings, presumably all of them aspects of reading involved in the study of literature, such as evaluation of a work in the light of the author's purpose, relating the parts of a work to each other, distinguishing between denotation and connotation of words in context, projecting oneself imaginatively into a work, and so forth. Three earlier questions (Nos. 58-60) asked to what extent and on what bases students in the first year English classes in the school as a whole were divided into ability groups, and also to what extent and on what bases the individual respondents grouped students in their English classes for instruction in reading.

The Teaching of Reading Units

Table 6 indicates the teachers' responses with respect to the extent to which the various "reading" units are taught (the percentages indicate the proportion of teachers who marked each of the alternative responses).

---

[1] In the questionnaire, the word "units" was followed by a parenthesis: "(or similar groupings of learning activities, yearly sequences, or matters more or less continually emphasized)."

TABLE 6: EXTENT TO WHICH VARIOUS READING UNITS ARE TAUGHT

Unit	Included in English Program as a Whole			Taught at Least Once in the Last Five Years by Respondent		
	Yes	No	Do Not Know	Yes	No	Does Not Apply
Reading of newspaper and periodicals	63.7%	25.2%	11.2%	69.6%	29.1%	1.3%
Propaganda analysis	52.7%	35.3%	11.6%	57.8%	38.6%	3.5%
Semantics	53.4%	36.1%	10.5%	55.9%	40.3%	3.4%
Critical reading of non-fiction prose	79.8%	13.1%	6.9%	78.6%	19.6%	1.7%
Study-type reading	35.1%	48.0%	16.9%	39.3%	53.6%	6.8%

The responses show that, with one exception, units of this type are being taught in the majority of public high schools and by the majority of the English teachers. Moreover, a sidelight afforded by the small percentages in the "Does Not Apply" column is that almost all of these English teachers regard the teaching of such "reading" units as their responsibility--as something that they might reasonably be expected to teach, whether or not in fact they are teaching them.

A point related to the last one is whether or not one should wish that the percentages in the "Yes" column for the individual teachers were higher than they are.[1] The question is difficult to answer without further evidence. Even though particular units are not taught by an individual teacher in a school, they may well be included in a part of the school's grade sequence in English with which that teacher is not involved.

The percentages in the left-hand section of the table can probably be interpreted and commented upon with less reservation. The relatively high percentage for critical reading of non-fiction prose is probably to be attributed to the teachers' thinking of their teaching of literature and especially of essay units. The percentages in the first three rows are much lower than desirable (it is desirable, of course, that they all be 100%), especially in an age of mass media, advertising, and ideological conflict. The (two) questions concerning "study-type reading" asked whether the English program included, and the respondent had actually taught, "a specific unit on a method of reading for the purpose of studying." Though it is highly probable that many high school students would benefit from instruction in some such method, it is not surprising that the percentages pertaining to it are the lowest of all (i.e., the percentage of "Yes" responses). A cross-tabulation on this point, however, showed that a greater proportion of teachers in junior high schools than of those in senior highs (grades 9-12 and 10-12) do teach units or lessons in such study-type reading. The percentages are, respectively, 52.5% and 36.6%; and the difference between the groups is significant beyond the .001 level.

---

[1] This section will include a degree of evaluative comment upon the findings, even though it might be considered better to postpone such comment until all the data have been presented objectively. Such postponement, however, would necessitate some repetition of the findings to be commented upon, and the comment might be more difficult to follow.

Teaching Reading Skills in the Teaching of Literature

One question (No. 84) in the survey instrument asked to what extent it was in the context of teaching literature that the respondents taught reading skills. As might be anticipated, 80.2% indicated that they did so chiefly in that context. However, only 36.6% indicated literature to be almost the sole context. Approximately 44% also taught reading skills at least to some extent through such units as those discussed above, and 14.5% taught them at least as much or more through such units.

The respondents were asked to what extent in their teaching they systematically attempted to develop various abilities and understandings needed for intelligent responsive reading of literature. They were asked to indicate the extent on a four-point scale. The percentages for each of the four ratings with respect to each ability or understanding[1] are shown in Table 7. The two middle ratings were not explicitly labeled in the questionnaire. A fifth category ("not pertinent to your teaching"), not included in the table, was marked in all but a few cases by less than 2% of the respondents.

Table 7 makes clear, especially if the percentages in the first two columns for each item are added together, that the large majority of teachers regard the development of all of these reading abilities and understandings as important objectives in their teaching of literature and that they are attempting to attain them. The percentages in the _A_ column are especially impressive in view of the usual disinclination to mark the highest category on a self-rating form. The fact that the largest percentage in that column falls to the ability to detect theme may possibly indicate that teachers are overly disposed to take a moralistic approach in teaching literature, particularly in view of the relatively low percentage who marked _A_ for the next item; but such an interpretation may be fanciful. Further comment on these findings will be postponed to the end of this section.

---

[1] If what is meant by several of the abilities and understandings is not clear from the abbreviated form in which they are described in Table 7, an examination of the more complete form in which they are stated in the questionnaire (Questions 89-100) should help to clarify the meaning.

TABLE 7: TEACHING READING IN CONTEXT OF LITERATURE: EXTENT TO WHICH TEACHERS EMPHASIZE VARIOUS SKILLS

Reading Ability and/or Understanding Pertaining to:	A Great Extent	B Moderately High Extent	C Moderately Low Extent	D Little or No Extent
Determining author's purpose in whole work and in parts	68.5%	24.1%	4.7%	1.2%
Evaluating (only) in light of author's purpose	44.5%	30.5%	15.5%	5.2%
Distinguishing narrator (voice) from author	46.5%	33.4%	13.5%	4.0%
Relating part to part	51.2%	34.2%	10.9%	1.8%
Detecting theme	70.8%	21.8%	5.9%	.9%
Awareness that theme is not the same as moral "lesson"	48.0%	30.7%	16.2%	3.3%
Distinguishing denotation and connotation in context	44.7%	33.9%	16.8%	3.3%
Understanding figurative language	55.8%	33.2%	9.3%	1.3%
Recognizing tone	50.9%	33.9%	10.8%	2.7%
Participating vicariously in experience of literary work	49.7%	36.2%	11.2%	1.6%
Understanding syntax in poetry	27.8%	35.1%	25.6%	8.2%
Sensitivity to sound of poetry	38.7%	36.5%	18.2%	4.7%

Other Practices in the Teaching of Reading

Questions Nos. 74-83 and 85-87 of the instrument were concerned with practices which are difficult to classify except under the term "other." The first three of these had to do, in turn, with word study (study of roots and affixes and of etymology, etc.), the expansion of students' vocabularies, and attempts to increase speed in reading. The respondents were asked what degree of emphasis was placed on each of these in the English program as a whole (in the third case, by the reading program of the school as a whole) and by the individual respondents in their own English classes. In this set of questions, also, responses were given as a mark on one point in a four-point scale. Table 8 presents the results. However, the percentages for the C rating ("To fair extent only") are omitted from the table, as are also those for a fifth category, "Do not know," with regard to the English or school program as a whole; or "Does not apply," with regard to the individual respondent's own classes.

TABLE 8: EMPHASIS ON WORD STUDY, EXPANSION OF VOCABULARY, AND INCREASE OF SPEED IN READING

Practice	Percent of Teachers Indicating Various Degrees of Emphasis					
	In Programs			In Own Classes		
	Great	Considerable	Little or no	Great	Considerable	Little or no
Word study	16.0%	37.2%	9.3%	26.2%	42.6%	4.5%
Expansion of vocabulary	25.8%	48.0%	2.6%	39.2%	46.2%	1.2%
Speed	8.2%	20.5%	31.5%	3.5%	12.4%	50.1%

Probably the most notable finding set forth in Table 8 is that few schools and even fewer English teachers are stressing increase in speed of reading. That the regular classroom teachers are not doing so is neither surprising nor particularly regrettable. It is proper that they should be more concerned with comprehension; and it is at least probable that activities designed to increase reading rate are better carried on in special classrooms and reading clinics and laboratories than in the regular classroom. Whether or not, on the other hand, high schools as a whole are providing students who need or wish to learn to read more rapidly with sufficient opportunities and facilities for doing so is a question that might legitimately be raised, in view of the percentages pertaining to the matter of speed in the first section of Table 8; but it will not be debated here.

Four other matters investigated by this set of questions were the extent to which the teachers use (a) materials and texts (other than literature texts) specifically designed for developing reading skills, (b) inventories to determine the reading interests of their students, (c) paperback books as part of their program in reading, and (d) reading records to be kept by their students of their voluntary reading. Table 9 presents the findings.

TABLE 9: FREQUENCY OF USE BY TEACHERS OF SPECIAL MATERIALS FOR READING INSTRUCTION, INTEREST INVENTORIES, PAPERBACKS, AND READING RECORDS

	Percent of Teachers Marking Response				
	Frequently	Fairly Often	Few Times Only	Never	Does Not Apply
Use of special materials for reading instruction	21.9%	27.2%	19.0%	27.0%	4.8%
Use of inventories of reading interests	11.9%	15.7%	28.7%	39.4%	4.2%
Use of paperbacks	66.2%	18.7%	9.2%	4.4%	1.5%
Use of reading records	44.9%	14.5%	17.6%	21.2%	1.9%

A specific finding related to the use of special materials in teaching reading is that only 16.8% of the respondents indicated that reading laboratory materials were used by many of the English teachers in their schools; 50.5% said that they were used by a small minority; and 26.1% said that none of the English teachers in their schools used them. The finding concerning the use of paperbacks confirms the general impression that many teachers have recognized their potentialities, especially for "hooking" students otherwise hard to convince of the benefits and pleasures derivable from books.[1] Reading interests of students can to a considerable extent be determined by study of records of what they do and do not read voluntarily; consequently, the low percentages pertaining to the use of interest inventories may to a degree be compensated for by the considerably higher percentages referring to the use of such reading records. Nevertheless, it could be wished that more teachers used either or both.

In view of the finding that 80% of the teachers teach reading skills chiefly in the context of literature, the first two percentages, taken together, in the row pertaining to the use of texts and materials designed specifically for the development of reading skills might be considered surprisingly high, even though they are not absolutely so. Whether or not such materials should be more widely used is a complex, debatable question and one probably not answerable in general terms. As a number of reading experts have stated, no one pattern or formula for reading programs can be universally prescribed.[2] There can be little doubt that special

---

[1] Daniel N. Fader and Morton H. Shaevitz, Hooked on Books (Berkley Medallion Book, New York: Berkley Publishing Corp., 1966).

[2] For example, Karlin, loc. cit., p. 7; Early, loc. cit., p. 396; Will J. Massey and Virginia D. Moore, Helping High School Students to Read Better, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 6.

special materials for reading instruction have a place in the reading program of any high school; whether or not and to what extent they should be used in the regular English classrooms depends on the design of the reading program as a whole in each school.

Two final points concerning practices remain to be described. (a) Approximately 41% of the teachers in some way group students in their classes for reading instruction either regularly or occasionally (11.4% regularly, and 29.3% occasionally); 17.2% rarely do so, and 29.9% never do so. About 12% answered that the question did not apply to them. (b) Specific instruction in the use of the library is given in the first year English program in almost all (at least 93.8%) of the schools, most frequently either by the librarian alone or by both the librarian and English teachers.

Comment on Teachers' Practices in Teaching Reading

In the writer's opinion, the findings of this study concerning the practices in teaching reading of the English teachers in the public high schools of the country present, certainly not a completely bright picture, but also certainly not a completely dark one. This is true especially of the findings set forth in Table 6, pertaining to the teaching of reading units, and Table 7, pertaining to the development of reading skills in the context of teaching literature. Poorly prepared though they have been for their task of reading instruction, most English teachers are striving to accomplish it. The next section of this chapter presents the teachers' own estimate of the degree of success of their efforts.

Before turning to that evaluation, however, it is necessary to discuss a possible implication of these findings--that the severe judgment on high school reading programs made by Squire and Applebee (see pages 8-10 above) may not be fully warranted. The writer's opinion is that, in themselves, the data of the present study do call that judgment into some question, but only to a quite limited extent. A survey study, such as the present one, is, precisely, a survey--that is, a kind of overview. In a questionnaire survey, it is difficult to probe deeply into such matters as teaching practices. The questions pertaining to these practices which the teachers were asked in this study were not, and hardly could be, very rigorous ones. They were quantitative rather than qualitative. The teachers' responses indicate nothing, therefore, of the quality of the reading units taught or of the teaching of them. Nor do they indicate even the amount of class time given to the units. Similarly, the quality of the teaching of reading skills in the context of literature is not revealed by the responses concerning that matter. The adverse judgment made by Squire and Applebee was based on a much more intensive and qualitative study, including classroom observation and interviewing of teachers.

Nevertheless, the findings of this portion of the present study are not to be denied or simply explained away. As Ruth Strang has pointed out, much of the teaching of reading skills in high school English classes is incidental or casual,[1] rather than the conscious, systematic process which Squire and Applebee rightly suggest it should be or become.[1] However, that at least numerous English teachers are quite conscious of this aspect of their reading is suggested by the size of the percentages who replied affirmatively when they were asked explicitly whether they teach various reading units and whether they deliberately and systematically attempt to develop various reading skills in their teaching of literature. That they are fully aware of the importance and the implications of the distinction made by Squire and Applebee between imparting knowledge of and about pieces of literature and "refinement of the processes of learning to read...with insight and discrimination" those and other pieces of literature[2]--of the difference between teaching literature and teaching the reading of literature[3]--is doubtful at best and is a point on which the present study sheds little if any light.

---

[1] Ruth Strang, "Teaching Reading, An Essential Part of Teaching English," _Reading in the Secondary Schools_, ed. M. Jerry Weiss (New York: Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961), p. 352.

(One additional suggestion concerning this matter is offered, very tentatively as well as parenthetically, as a possible tempering of the severity of Squire and Applebee's judgment. When one observes in schools reputed to be "superior," one expects much and is likely to be more disappointed with what one finds than would be the case were expectations less high. Observation of practices of the same quality in schools with lesser reputations might result in somewhat more favorable judgments. If this hypothesis is at all tenable, the implication is that it can be tested only by further research, of the intensive sort exhibited in the Squire and Applebee study, into practices in a random sample of high schools.)

Teachers' Evaluation of Their Own Performance

A set of questions (Nos. 35-37) in the survey instrument asked the teachers to evaluate their own individual effectiveness in meeting the needs for reading instruction of their students: the average, the above-average, and the below-average in turn. The findings are presented only briefly at this point; they are analyzed at greater depth in the next chapter. That is, Chapter IV indicates the influence on the ratings of such variables as years of teaching experience and various kinds of preparation for the teaching of reading.

Table 10 presents the findings, as usual in terms of percentages of the sample who marked each of the various possible responses. However, in calculating the percentages for each row of this table, the number of teachers who marked the "Does not apply" response in answering the pertinent question was omitted. (That response was marked by 9.0% of the total group with respect to meeting the needs of the average student, 12.4% with respect to the above-average, and 15.2% with respect to the below-average--apparently indicating in each case that the teachers who thus responded do not have in their classes students of the particular level of reading ability or general ability.)

---

[1] Squire and Applebee, _op_. _cit_., pp. 107-108, 155, 257.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 107.

[3] Ibid., p. 156.

TABLE 10: TEACHERS' SELF-RATINGS WITH RESPECT TO MEETING READING NEEDS

Level of Students	Percent Indicating Various Degrees of Effectiveness		
	Very Well	Moderately Well	Poorly
Average	10.7%	67.0%	22.2%
Above-average	27.2%	57.1%	15.7%
Below-average	7.6%	33.6%	58.8%

As Table 10 indicates, only a small proportion of teachers consider themselves to be teaching reading very well to average students, and an even smaller group think that they do well with the below-average. Why so many believe that they are doing at least moderately well with the above-average can only be surmised; possibly it is simply that they believe that this group of students has less need for reading instruction. That so many teachers consider themselves to be failing to meet the reading needs of the below-average student is not surprising; their training for the teaching of reading is probably in fact most deficient precisely with respect to the students most in need. The percentages in the middle column of the table, on the other hand, are surprisingly high. In retrospect and in view of the known tendency to choose the mid-point in a three-point rating scale, it is unfortunate that a four-point scale was not used instead for this set and for the next set of questions to be discussed. Had it been, the percentages for the other ratings probably would have been much the same, but it seems likely that the percentages for the "moderately well" response would have been considerably lower.[1]

Teachers' Evaluation of Reading Instruction in English Programs

Another set of three questions (Nos. 32-34) asked the respondents to rate the effectiveness of the teaching of reading by the English teachers as a whole (as supplemented by reading specialists) in their schools, again with regard to meeting the needs of the average, the above-average, and the below-average student. The responses are presented in Table 11. To make the table exactly comparable with Table 10, the teachers who marked the "Do not know" response (i.e., did not know the reading program as a whole well enough to judge it) were omitted in the calculation of percentages for the table. (For the three questions, an average of 13.9% marked that response, with a range from 12.4% to 14.8%). Comparison of Tables 10 and 11 makes evident that the respondents' evaluations of reading instruction by English teachers as a whole in their schools is very similar to their evaluation of their own teaching of reading. Insofar as there are differences, they indicate that the respondents as a whole believe that they are meeting the reading needs of the average and above-average somewhat better than are the other English teachers in their schools, but that the latter are meeting the needs of the below-average somewhat better than they.

---

[1] See further comment on this point, and on the ratings in Tables 10 and 11, below (page 38).

TABLE 11: EVALUATION BY RESPONDENTS OF TEACHING OF READING BY ENGLISH TEACHERS AS A WHOLE IN THEIR SCHOOLS

Level of Students	Percent Indicating Various Degrees of Effectiveness in Meeting Reading Needs		
	Very Well	Moderately Well	Poorly
Average	8.0%	58.0%	34.0%
Above-average	21.1%	52.0%	26.7%
Below-average	12.2%	32.1%	55.7%

Responsibility for Planning Reading Instruction in English Program

Questions 30 and 31 asked the teachers to indicate who in their school, or school system, had major responsibility for planning the program for reading instruction in the English program of the school.[1] Table 12 indicates the proportion who indicated each person or group as having the responsibility.

TABLE 12: LOCUS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR PLANNING READING INSTRUCTION IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM

Person or Group	Percent of Schools	Person or Group	Percent of Schools
Curriculum Department or Similar Agency of School System	21.7%	Reading Specialist(s) in the School	31.1%
English Department of the School	11.2%	Curriculum Director(s) in the School.	6.3%
The Individual English Teachers	29.2%	Superintendent, Principal, or Assistant Principal	4.8%
Chairman of English Department	6.3%	Do Not Know	11.9%

---

[1] This is obviously only one question, but for technical reasons it had to be spread over two items in the questionnaire. Some of the respondents evidently failed to understand the arrangement and, contrary to instructions, marked more than one response. Consequently, the percentages add up to more than 100%.

It is notable that responsibility for planning the instruction in question is assigned most frequently to the reading specialist(s) in the school. The finding that only 11.2% of the respondents indicate that the English department as a whole in the school has the major responsibility for this planning accords quite well with the finding reported earlier that only 14.4% of English departments discuss the teaching of reading frequently enough to justify considering it to be a major concern. Both of these latter two percentages should be considered together with the percentage referring to the individual English teachers (29.2%) and that for the "Do Not Know" response (11.9%). Since the questionnaire was administered early in the school year, the approximately 3% of the respondents who were in their first year of teaching[1] understandably might not know the answer to this question concerning responsibility for planning reading instruction; but the fact that an additional 8.9% also indicated that they did not know suggests that they too might well be considered to be in schools in which planning for such instruction is left mainly to the initiative and resources of the individual teachers of English. Thus, it seems legitimate to consider 38.1% (29.2% plus 8.9%) as a more accurate representation of the proportion of such schools. It would seem necessary that, if the reading program in English is to be systematic and sequential, it should be planned cooperatively and, especially, that the English teachers as a group in each school should have a major share in its planning. Consequently, the percentage referring to the English department would appear to be very much lower than is desirable, and the one referring to individual teachers much too high. However, the fact that the question did not distinguish between planning for remedial programs and planning for developmental programs necessitates caution in making this and other interpretations and judgments.

In response to another question (No. 55), 60.7% of the teachers in schools which do have remedial programs in reading indicated that the English teachers as a whole in those schools are responsible for and involved in those programs to little or no extent.

Teachers' Evaluation of Developmental Reading Program in English Classes

One question (No. 63) asked the teachers for their "personal evaluation of the reading program in English classes for developing more advanced skills in students not in need of remedial instruction." In effect, the latter part of the question is a definition of developmental reading instruction. Table 13 indicates the proportions assigning the various ratings.

TABLE 13: TEACHERS' RATING OF DEVELOPMENTAL READING PROGRAM IN ENGLISH CLASSES

Rating	Percentage
Excellent	4.3%
Good	25.9%
Fair	29.3%
Poor	27.7%
Do Not Know	12.7%

---

[1] Cf. responses to Question No. 7.

It is particularly worthwhile to compare this table with Table 11. The first two rows of that table presumably are concerned with developmental reading also, since they have to do with meeting the reading needs of average and above-average students. Consequently, if the respondents were consistent, the ratings shown in Table 11 should correspond well with the ratings in this table. The percentages for "Poorly" in that table do in fact correspond well with the percentage for "Poor" in this table.[1] The percentages for "Very Well" in Table 11 and the percentage for "Excellent" in this table, though not very close, are reasonably similar, especially in view of the fact that Table 13 is based on a four-point rating scale and Table 11 on a scale of three points only. The figures in Table 13, the writer believes, confirm the earlier comment (page 35) concerning the relatively high percentages in the "Moderately Well" columns of Tables 11 and 10 as well. The teachers' ratings in the present instance would seem to make it highly probable that if a fourth alternative response, "Fairly Well," had been available to them (rather than only "Very Well," "Moderately Well," and "Poorly") when they were making their evaluations in that earlier set of questions, many of them would have marked it; and thus the percentages in the "Moderately Well" column of Table 11 (and Table 10) would have been considerably lower.

An earlier comparison of Tables 10 and 11 revealed that the teachers' evaluation of themselves and of other English teachers with respect to the teaching of reading are very similar. Table 13, therefore, is probably a good representation of the teachers' opinions of their own personal effectiveness in developmental reading, and not only of the effectiveness of such instruction in English classes as a whole. Moreover, in light of the consideration presented in the preceding paragraph, the table is probably a more exact representation of that opinion than is Table 10. In any event, Table 13 is almost certainly a more exact representation of the respondents' evaluation of the program of developmental reading in English classes as a whole in their schools than is Table 11. It is notable, therefore, that the table indicates that considerably more than half (57%) of the teachers consider that program to be fair at best, and that more than a quarter of them think it definitely poor.

Teachers' Evaluation of Remedial Reading Programs in Their Schools

As was emphasized at the beginning of this report, the chief focus of this study was the teaching of reading by English teachers in regular English classrooms. Several questions, however, in the survey instrument pertained to aspects of the total reading program of high schools in which the regular classroom English teachers in some schools might not be much involved. One of these aspects was the remedial program.

As was mentioned earlier, 60.7% of the teachers in schools which do have remedial reading programs indicated that the English teachers as a whole in those schools are involved in those programs little or not at all. However, 11.9% indicated that the English teachers were greatly involved in such a program in their schools, and 24.5% indicated that teachers were involved to a moderate extent in the remedial programs of their particular schools.

The respondents were asked two questions (Nos. 43-46) concerning the reading levels of the students in their schools. Tables 14 and 15 present their response.

---

[1] The percentages in Table 13 would all be somewhat higher if the "Do Not Know" responses had been omitted in the calculation of percentages.

TABLE 14: PROPORTION OF STUDENTS IN FIRST YEAR OF SCHOOL WHO ARE AT LEAST TWO GRADE LEVELS BELOW PROPER GRADE LEVEL IN READING

Proportion of Students	Percent of Respondents Indicating Various Proportions
15% or Fewer of 1st Year Students in the School	19.7%
16% - 25% of 1st Year Students in the School	37.8%
26% - 40% of 1st Year Students in the School	28.3%
41% - 60% of 1st Year Students in the School	10.5%
Over 60% of 1st Year Students in the School	3.7%

TABLE 15: GRADE LEVEL AT WHICH AVERAGE FIRST-YEAR STUDENT IN SCHOOL READS

Reading Grade Level	Percent of Respondents Indicating Various Grade Levels
At or Above Proper Grade Level	46.7%
1 - 2 Years Below Proper Grade Level	44.5%
3 - 4 Years Below Proper Grade Level	7.7%
5 - 6 Years Below Proper Grade Level	1.1%

As the tables evidence[1] (if any such evidence is needed), in less than half of the schools do the average (i.e., typical) entering first-year students read at their proper grade level, and in over 40% of the schools more than a quarter of all entering first-year students are reading at least two grades below their proper level. The figures confirm the great need for remedial programs (again, if any such confirmation be needed).

---

[1] The complete accuracy of the evidence cannot be guaranteed. The teachers were asked to base their answers, if possible, upon standardized test scores. How many were able to do so is not known.

Question No. 47 asked the teachers to what extent it was true of their individual schools that they had systematically planned remedial reading programs. Almost exactly one-third (33.04%) replied that it was true to little or no extent (in effect, that there were no such programs in their schools), and 29.6% that it was true to a fair extent only. Thus, although Table 14 would indicate that few if any schools can afford to do without a remedial program, a large proportion of them are doing so; and almost as many again appear to have unsatisfactory programs. In answer to the same question, 12.3% marked the "To a very considerable extent" response, and 22.1% the "To considerable extent" response. Approximately 60% of the schools conduct at least one special class for remedial reading, but close to 40% have no such classes (see Question No. 56).

A pair of questions (Nos. 48 and 49) asked for an evaluation, first, of the remedial reading program for the first-year students in the respondent's school and then of the remedial program for students above the first year. In calculating the percentages for Table 16, in which the findings are presented, those who indicated that their schools had no such program or that they did not know it well enough to judge it were omitted. As the table indicates, in the large majority of schools which do have remedial reading programs of some sort, the English teachers believe those programs to be inadequate, in many cases quite inadequate. To what extent the judgment is deserved cannot, of course, be determined from the data of this study.

TABLE 16: TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL READING PROGRAMS IN THEIR SCHOOLS

Remedial Programs	Percent of Respondents Indicating Various Ratings			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
For First-Year Students	8.5%	30.3%	33.3%	27.9%
For Students Above First Year	5.0%	22.4%	38.2%	38.2%

One further finding pertinent to remedial programs should be noted. Apparently only a very small number of high schools require any minimal grade-level score in reading that must be attained before students are permitted to pass from the first year or term to the second year or term. Only twenty-two teachers out of the total of 904 who answered this question (No. 61) reported that their schools did have such a requirement. (Twenty-nine indicated that there was such a requirement with respect to passing from one higher grade to another.)

Reading Specialists in the High Schools

Several findings pertaining to the work of reading specialists were mentioned earlier in this report. In this section, all of the findings of the study concerning reading specialists will be brought together.[1]

Number of Reading Specialists

Forty-two percent of the teachers reported that their school had no reading specialist; 37.4% reported one; 17.2% two or three, 2.3% four or five, and 1.1% said that their school had more than five.

The question concerning number of reading specialists in the schools was cross-tabulated with several other questions: those concerning the grades included in the school, school enrollment, and type of area in which the school was located. (In stating the findings concerning matters such as these, it is necessary to emphasize again that the study sampled teachers, not schools; the figures cited, therefore, are probably only fairly representative of schools in the nation as a whole.) The cross-tabulation with type of high school showed that, generally speaking, junior high schools are better supplied with reading specialists than are schools with 7-12, 9-12, or 10-12 organizations. Of the 190 junior high schools in the study, only 28.4% had no reading specialist, as compared with 42.0%, 48.3%, and 48.7% respectively for the schools of the other three types just named. With respect to number of reading specialists in the schools that do have them, the percentages throughout the range from one to five are all in favor of the junior high schools. The cross-tabulation with size of school showed, hardly surprisingly, that the larger the school the better supplied with reading specialists it is likely to be. Nevertheless, 36.1% of the teachers in schools with enrollments from 1,000 to 1,999 reported having no reading specialist in their school, as did 29.4% from schools with over 2,000 students. However, the corresponding percentages for small schools are much larger: 65.5% for schools under 200 and 54.8% for those with enrollments from 200 to 499. The figure for medium-sized schools (500-999) was 51.4%.

Schools in rural areas and small towns are the most likely to have no reading specialist on the staff (51.1% and 53.5% respectively), suburban schools the least likely (27.5%). As to schools in cities (defined in the study as municipalities with populations over 60,000), the relationship between population and number of reading specialists in the schools tended to be inverse: fewer (29.5%) of the schools in the smaller cities were completely without reading specialists than were schools in the larger cities (40.4%, 46.2%, and 41.2% for the three categories of larger cities). Moreover, the percentage of schools in the smaller cities which had from two to five specialists was considerably higher (31.6%) than the percentages of the schools in larger cities (21.3%, 20.5%, and 22.7%).

Role of Reading Specialists

Table 17 indicates the role of the reading specialists and the extent to which they engage in various activities in that role, as indicated by the teachers in the study. In calculating the percentages, the responses of those who indicated that their schools had no reading specialist and of those who marked the "Do Not Know" response were omitted. No implication is intended that all of the functions of reading specialists are represented in this table. In response to two earlier questions (Nos. 22 and 23), 32.9% of the teachers indicated that reading specialists had conducted demonstrations of reading instruction in their schools, and 40.7% that lectures by or discussions with reading specialists concerning such instruction had been part of the inservice training program in their schools. (In these two instances, however, it is not clear whether the reading specialists were members of the faculties of the schools concerned.) Moreover, as was stated on an earlier page, 31.1% of the respondents indicated that major responsibility for planning reading instruction in their schools was held by the reading specialist(s) in their schools. No doubt, in many schools such specialists are largely or chiefly responsible for administering standardized reading tests.

---

[1] See Questions Nos. 50-54 and also 22-23.

TABLE 17: ROLE OF READING SPECIALISTS: EXTENT OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR AND INVOLVEMENT IN VARIOUS ACTIVITIES

Activity	Percent of Teachers Indicating Various Extents		
	Great Extent	Moderate Extent	Little or No Extent
Teaching Special Remedial Reading Class	48.4%	35.1%	16.5%
Giving Individual Instruction to Students Below Level in Reading	34.8%	46.2%	19.0%
Helping Individual English Teachers to Improve in Reading Instruction	8.0%	22.8%	69.2%
Helping English Teachers in Group Sessions	2.0%	13.3%	84.7%

In the table itself, the most striking figures are those showing that in the large majority of schools English teachers receive little assistance from reading specialists to help them improve their own reading instruction. This finding agrees with those of the Continuing Education study and the Squire and Applebee study concerning this point. The finding does not, of course, carry with it its own explanation. It may be simply that there are too few reading specialists and that the few that there are in any one school are too busy with their other duties to have time for this function. Too, it is well known that in many or even most schools little time is available in the schedule for teachers' meetings of any kind. Despite these possible explanations, it remains unfortunate that only in a small proportion of schools are reading specialists actually providing the assistance which their special training makes them capable of and from which the English teachers could benefit much.

Socio-Economic Class of Students and the Teaching of Reading

As was pointed out in the second chapter, a considerable proportion of the sample, something like 19%, failed to follow directions and marked more than one social-class category as being that of the majority of students in their schools. The proportions indicated for the lower class, middle class, upper class, and mixture of lower and middle classes are very probably completely accurate, but not so those for the other possible combinations (see page 19). Although the analysis of the data included a detailed comparison of the "lower class" schools with all of the other schools with respect to various aspects of the reading program in those schools, the findings are presented only briefly, because of that flaw in the data.

The data concerning this point were obtained by a set of cross-tabulations in which the "lower class" schools (i.e., the responses of the teachers in those schools) were compared against the schools of all the other social-class categories combined into one. The differences between the two groups were tested for statistical significance by Chi square.

The findings of the cross-tabulation with respect to the reading level of entering first-year students in the schools in the various social-class categories were what was to be expected--so much so as to warrant considering them at least to be reliable. The lower class schools differed greatly (with significance beyond the .001 level) from the others with respect to this point. For example, in 85.4% of the former at least a fourth of the entering first-year students were reported to be two or more grades below their proper level, as compared with 37.2% of the other schools. More specifically, 28.1% of the teachers from lower class schools reported that over 60% of the entering class were thus behind in reading, while less than 1% of the other teachers did so.

The data from the other cross-tabulations are notable, even striking; it is regrettable that there is any reason to think them at all unreliable. They do not at all support the frequent allegation that the instructional programs in schools with enrollments predominantly of lower class students are inferior to those in other schools--not, at least, with respect to the aspects of the reading program investigated in this study. With remarkable consistency, the differences found between the lower class schools and the other group of schools with regard to those aspects are in favor of the lower class schools. Six of the differences are statistically significant, four at or beyond the .001 level and two at the .05 level. There were no statistically significant differences in favor of the other group of schools. Even the differences which are not statistically significant are important, because they indicate that the lower class schools are, in these respects, as good (or as bad) as the other schools--not different from them.

The six significant differences were with respect to the teachers' evaluation of their preparation for teaching reading, their use of special materials designed for reading instruction, their evaluation of their effectiveness in teaching reading to average students, the giving of some form of inservice training in the school, attendance at reading conferences and the frequency with which assistance is given to the individual English teachers to help them improve in reading instruction. One notable absence from this list is the teachers' evaluation of their teaching reading to below-average students. The percentages of teachers who rated themselves as performing poorly in this respect were nearly identical for lower class schools and other schools; 52.8% and 58.7% respectively. There were no significant differences with respect to the nineteen aspects of the reading program; in all but four, however, the percentages favored the lower class schools. These aspects included such matters as the number of years of teaching experience, the number of reading specialists in the school, the proportion of teachers who had been English majors in college, the teachers' evaluation of the school's remedial reading program, and whether or not various reading units were taught in the school.

It is recognized that, even without the defect in the data that has been mentioned, a survey study such as this could not be an adequate test of the quality of the reading programs in lower class schools as compared with those in other schools. The findings, however, do suggest the possibility, as a hypothesis to be tested in further research, that the preparation of the English teachers in those schools and their practices in the teaching of reading are at least on a level with the preparation of teachers and the practices in other schools. Whether or not that level is in itself adequate to meet the reading needs of students in either group of schools is another question.

IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA (II): THE RELATIONSHIP OF PREPARATION TO PRACTICES AND SELF-RATINGS WITH RESPECT TO READING INSTRUCTION

This chapter presents the findings with relation to the last of the five questions which the study investigated. That question was whether the practices in reading instruction of English teachers who have been better prepared differ significantly from those of English teachers who have been less well prepared. The analysis of the data also included investigation of the relationship of various kinds of preparation to the teachers' ratings of their personal preparation and of their effectiveness in reading instruction. This investigation involved study of the interrelations of a large number of variables.

Design of the Analysis

Since the questionnaire consisted of one hundred questions, the number of possible cross-tabulations of variables (i.e., comparison of the responses to each question with the responses to each one of all the other questions in the questionnaire, one comparison at a time) was extremely large. Many of the comparisons, however, would not have been meaningful; nor would all of the meaningful ones be pertinent to the central topic. Moreover, there are practical limitations of time and expense. The actual number of such comparisons made in the present study was approximately five hundred.

The comparisons were made by means of contingency tables, most of them of the 2 x 2 variety. For illustration, in a typical one of these the teachers who had had a course on the teaching of reading were compared against those who had not had such a course, with respect to their rating of their preparation for teaching reading as good or poor. The actual table in which this cross-tabulation was made, with the frequencies and percentages found for each cell in the 2 x 2 table, is shown in Table 18. Reference to the table will help to make clear the design of this part of the analysis as a whole.

In such cross-tabulations, one of the pairs of variables (for example, having had or not having had a reading course) is the independent, or "cause," variable; while the other is the dependent, or "result," variable (for example, rating of one's preparation for teaching reading as good or poor). In some cases, the same variable can be viewed as independent with respect to some other variable and dependent with respect to a third. Thus, evaluation of one's preparation is dependent on what kinds of preparation one has received, but it may also function as an independent variable with respect to some other variable or set of variables--such as what or how one teaches, or how one rates one's effectiveness.

TABLE 18:

CONTINGENCY TABLE: COMPARISON OF SELF-RATINGS OF PREPARATION FOR TEACHING READING OF TEACHERS WHO HAD AND TEACHERS WHO DID NOT HAVE READING COURSE

Question 14:	Question 13: Rates Self Poorly Prepared	Question 13: Rates Self Well Prepared	TOTAL	PERCENT
Had Course	24.8% f = 81	75.2% f = 246	327	36.2
Did Not Have Course	65.7% f = 379	34.3% f = 198	577	63.8
TOTAL	460	444	904	
PERCENT	50.9	49.1		100.0

(Percentages in cells are based on totals for rows.)

Yates Chi square = 138.163** Significant beyond .001 level.
(with 1 degree of freedom)

No. of missing units = 8

Phi coefficient of correlation = .393

(For use in 2 x 2 table, responses to each question were dichotomized. See text and Appendix B.)

A considerable number of cross-tabulations of two variables were also conducted in which a third variable was held constant--for example, number of years of teaching experience, or whether or not the teachers had graduate degrees.

The decision concerning which particular cross-tabulations it was most important to conduct was determined by the nature of the basic question under investigation: Whether various kinds (and varying degrees) of preparation had a differential effect upon practices in the teaching of reading and also upon the teachers' ratings of their preparation and of their effectiveness in reading instruction. In that question, preparation is the independent variable (in generalized form); and teaching practices and self-ratings are the dependent variable(s) (again in generalized form). Consequently, the writer constructed two lists: one a set of specific kinds of preparation to serve as the independent variables in the cross-tabulations; and the other of specific practices and self-ratings, to serve as the dependent variables.[1]

For use in the 2 x 2 tables, the response categories for each question involved had to be combined ("collapsed") into dichotomies, if they were not already in that form (as were, for example, the simple Yes-No responses). The specific combinations of response categories for each question involved are described in Appendix B. The general procedure was to divide each set of responses, in effect at the median, into what hereafter in the report will be termed in general a "High" category and a "Low" category.[2] "Do not know" and "Does not apply" responses were omitted. Also omitted in the collapsing of categories for several cross tabulations (not as many as would be desirable) was the "middle" category or categories of response (such as "Occasionally"). The purpose of this latter procedure was to provide a better opportunity for the differential effects of the more completely "High" and/or "Low" categories (such as "Frequently" and "Rarely") to reveal themselves.

Following are the two lists of variables, independent and dependent, which were cross-tabulated.

---

[1] No cross-tabulations were conducted of the independent variables against the teachers' indications of practices in reading instruction of the English department as a whole or their ratings of the school's reading program as a whole, inasmuch as the character of a department or school as a whole would be dependent on many variables over and above the personal preparation of the individual respondents.

[2] Thus, in Question 13 (see questionnaire and Table 18) responses A, B, and C (Very well prepared, Well prepared, and Fairly well prepared) were combined into one (High) category of Well Prepared; and responses D and E (Rather poorly prepared and Very poorly prepared) into one (Low) category of Poorly Prepared.

Independent Variables:

(A) Question 7: Number of years of teaching experience

(B) " 9: Major in college--English or other

(C) " 11: Having or not having graduate degree (in any subject)

(D) " 14: Having had or not having had course on teaching of reading

(E) " 18: Extent to which teaching of reading was treated in English methods course

(F) " 21: Some form of inservice training in teaching of reading at school during last five years

(G) " 26: Extent of discussion of teaching of reading in English department

(H) " 27: Frequency of assistance to English teachers in teaching reading--in general (by whatever persons)

(I) " 53: Extent of assistance from reading specialist--individual

(J) " 54: Extent of assistance from reading specialist--in group sessions

(K) " 13: Evaluation of preparation

(L) " 38: Acceptance of high school's responsibility in reading instruction--general

(M) " 39: Acceptance of high school's responsibility for developmental reading instruction

(N) " 1: Grades included in school: junior or senior high

(O) " 2: Enrollment of school

The last five variables in the list are of a somewhat different character from the others. The last two might better be designated control variables. The other three (K, L, and M) were also used as dependent variables in some other cross-tabulations (see page 45 concerning this point).

(One other factor that was used as a kind of independent variable in a set of cross-tabulations was the socio-economic class of the majority of students in the school. The analysis involving this factor is discussed at the end of the preceding chapter.)

The words or phrases which are underlined in the description of each of the independent variables in the list above and in the following list of dependent variables will henceforth be used as a kind of abbreviation when it is necessary to refer to that particular variable. (Numerals have been used for the listing and labeling of the dependent variables to contradistinguish them from the independent variables, for which capital letters were used.)

As was mentioned previously, three of the variables in the following list were used also as independent variables: the evaluation of preparation variable and the two variables with respect to accepting the high school's responsibility for reading.

Dependent Variables:

1. Question 13: Evaluation of preparation
2. " 20: Recency of attendance at reading conference
3. " 35: Effectiveness in meeting reading needs of average student
4. " 36: Effectiveness in meeting needs of above-average
5. " 37: Effectiveness in meeting needs of below-average
6. " 38: Acceptance of high school's responsibility in reading instruction--general
7. " 39: Acceptance of high school's responsibility for developmental reading instruction
8. " 59: Frequency of grouping for reading instruction
9. " 79: Amount of emphasize on increasing reading speed
10. " 65: Teaching unit on newspapers and periodicals
11. " 67: Teaching unit on propaganda analysis and advertisements
12. " 69: Teaching unit on semantics
13. " 71: Teaching unit on critical reading of non-fiction
14. " 73: Teaching unit on study-type reading
15. " 82: Frequency of use of special materials designed for teaching of reading
16. " 84: Extent of teaching of reading in contexts other than literature
17. " 85: Extent of use of reading interest inventory
18. " 87: Extent of use of student voluntary reading record
19. " 75: Amount of emphasis on word study
20. " 88: Extent to which the teacher reads books, articles, reports about teaching of reading

(21.--27.)

Questions 89, 90, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98:
Aspects of the teaching of reading through literature:

21. Amount of emphasis on determining author's purpose
22. Amount of emphasis on evaluating in light of author's purpose
23. Amount of emphasis on distinguishing voice from author
24. Amount of emphasis on relating parts of the literary work to each other and to the whole
25. Amount of emphasis on denotation and connotation
26. Amount of emphasis on recognizing tone
27. Amount of emphasis on vicarious experience and imaginative participation through and in literature

The Findings

With very few exceptions, each of the fifteen independent variables was cross-tabulated against each of the dependent variables.[1] The data from the cross-tabulations are presented in the following pair of tables, Tables 19a and 19b. They are presented in the tables in two forms: percentages and Phi coefficients of correlation; what was being correlated in each case was a particular independent variable and a particular dependent variable. Each cross-tabulation was conducted by means of a 2 x 2 contingency table, such as the one illustrated in Table 18. Table 19a presents the data from the cross-tabulations of independent variables A-H with all of the dependent variables; and Table 19b presents the data from the cross-tabulations of independent variables I-O with all of the dependent variables.[2] The statistical significance of the relationship of each pair of variables was tested by Chi square. In the tables, the pertinent percentages and Phi coefficients are given only for the cases in which the relationship was in fact statistically significant at the .05 level or beyond. The Phi coefficients which were significant at the .01 level are underlined; those which were significant at the .001 level or beyond are doubly underlined; those which are not underlined at all were significant at the .05 level. The relationships which were not significant are indicated by the symbol n.s. (not significant).

The two percentages found in Tables 19a and 19b at the intersection of each independent variable with each dependent variable were taken from the two right-hand cells, the "High" cell and the "Low" cell,[3] in the pertinent 2 x 2 contingency table. The tables are to be interpreted in the following fashion: The percentages in Table 19a at the intersection A-1, independent variable A and dependent variable No. 1, indicate that 59.1% of the teachers with seven or more years of experience ("High" in experience) rated themselves as well prepared to teach reading, while only 32.0% of those with less than seven years ("Low" in experience) did so. The double-underlining under the Phi coefficient shows that the relationship between the two variables is statistically highly significant (at or beyond the .001 level). In the case just below this one, at the intersection B-1, the fact that the percentage from the High cell on the independent variable is lower than that from the Low cell shows that the correlation is negative (-.09 is the Phi coefficient) between having had English as one's college major and self-rating of preparation to teach reading. Such negative correlations were found extremely rarely and only with respect to this particular independent variable (B: Major in College) and independent variable N (Senior or Junior High School, in which Senior was considered "High"). Further explanation and discussion of the data in Tables 19a and 19b will be deferred until after their presentation.

---

[1] The total number of cross-tabulations actually conducted for this part of the analysis falls slightly short of the possible total of 405 (the 15 independent variables with each of the 27 dependent variables) because in a very few cases a particular independent variable and a particular dependent variable were not cross-tabulated.

[2] Two tables are used rather than one simply because of problems of space.

[3] High and Low, that is, with respect to the independent variable. Both cells are High with respect to the dependent variable (e.g., self-rating of preparation to teach reading, in the sample contingency table presented in Table 18.

TABLE 19a: RELATION OF PREPARATION (INDEPENDENT VARIABLES A-H) TO PRACTICES AND SELF-RATINGS

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES A-H	DEPENDENT VARIABLES 1-9								
	1. Evaluation of Preparation	2. Attendance at Reading Conference	3. Meeting Needs of Average Student	4. Meeting Needs of Above-average	5. Meeting Needs of Below-average	6. Acceptance of Responsibility of High School for Reading	7. Responsibility Also for Developmental Reading	8. Frequency of Grouping for Reading	9. Emphasis on Increasing Speed in Reading
A. Years of Experience						n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
% in High Cell	59.1	54.3	81.9	87.3	44.5				20.9
% in Low Cell	32.0	32.2	70.8	79.0	35.6				11.7
Phi coefficient	.26	.21	.13	.11	.09				.17
B. Major in College			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell	46.5	42.6							
% in Low Cell	56.3	55.5							
Phi coefficient	-.09	-.11							
C. Graduate Degree			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell	54.7	54.1				85.2			
% in Low Cell	44.1	39.4				79.9			
Phi coefficient	.11	.15				.07			
D. Reading Course				n.s.			n.s.		
% in High Cell	75.2	67.0	88.5		53.1	87.8		56.5	24.7
% in Low Cell	34.3	34.3	71.3		33.9	79.1		40.6	13.5
Phi coefficient	.39	.315	.20		.19	.11		.15	.14
E. Reading Treated in Methods Course						n.s.			
% in High Cell	85.1	69.2	93.9	92.6	58.5		85.6	60.1	30.7
% in Low Cell	37.3	38.0	73.7	81.9	35.4		76.8	44.1	11.6
Phi coefficient	.44	.285	.235	.14	.215		.10	.15	.23
F. Inservice Training				n.s.		n.s.	n.s.		
% in High Cell	60.0	68.2	83.4		49.4			54.9	25.2
% in Low Cell	44.4	33.2	76.4		33.5			39.3	12.0
Phi coefficient	.16	.35	.11		.16			.16	.17
G. Discussion in English Department						n.s.	n.s.		
% in High Cell	69.0	68.5	94.3	95.1	60.2			64.4	32.5
% in Low Cell	38.9	35.2	70.2	80.4	28.9			37.4	10.9
Phi coefficient	.245	.27	.23	.165	.27			.22	.245
H. Assistance to Teachers--General						n.s.	n.s.		
% in High Cell	66.9	63.8	90.6	90.9	70.4			62.1	30.5
% in Low Cell	41.3	36.4	73.7	82.7	28.2			40.8	11.8
Phi coefficient	.21	.23	.17	.09	.37			.18	.21

TABLE 19a--Continued

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES A-H	DEPENDENT VARIABLES 10-18								
	10. Teaching Unit on Newspapers and Periodicals	11. Teaching Unit on Propaganda and Advertising	12. Teaching Unit on Semantics	13. Teaching Unit on Critical Reading of Non-fiction	14. Teaching Unit on Study-type Reading	15. Use of Special Materials for Reading Instruction	16. Reading Not Taught Solely Through Literature	17. Use of Reading Interest Inventory	18. Use of Student Reading Record
A. Years of Experience	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.		
% in High Cell						56.6		31.8	63.7
% in Low Cell						43.1		23.9	55.1
Phi coefficient						.13		.085	.085
B. Major in College	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell					40.0				
% in Low Cell					48.9				
Phi coefficient					-.08				
C. Graduate Degree	n.s.				n.s.	n.s.			n.s.
% in High Cell		63.8	63.6	84.6			64.9	33.1	
% in Low Cell		56.3	52.8	75.9			57.9	25.1	
Phi coefficient		.08	.11	.11			.07	.09	
D. Reading Course			n.s.						
% in High Cell	75.6	64.7		83.7	57.6	63.3	71.8	38.9	68.3
% in Low Cell	67.6	57.3		77.8	33.3	44.9	55.2	22.8	56.0
Phi coefficient	.08	.07		.07	.24	.18	.16	.17	.12
E. Reading Treated in Methods Course		n.s.	n.s.				n.s.		n.s.
% in High Cell	81.4			87.9	51.6	68.9		47.9	
% in Low Cell	69.2			80.6	40.3	46.6		23.1	
Phi coefficient	.125			.09	.10	.205		.25	
F. Inservice Training		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.					n.s.
% in High Cell	76.5				49.8	64.4	69.7	33.9	
% in Low Cell	67.1				36.0	41.0	57.5	26.5	
Phi coefficient	.09				.14	.23	.13	.08	
G. Discussion in English Department		n.s.	n.s.						
% in High Cell	78.1			88.9	54.3	76.2	73.4	45.9	66.1
% in Low Cell	68.3			78.5	39.0	42.3	59.4	21.2	55.2
Phi coefficient	.09			.105	.12	.27	.12	.22	.09
H. Assistance to Teachers--General	n.s.	n.s.							n.s.
% in High Cell			68.7	85.1	53.5	69.2	72.9	44.2	
% in Low Cell			54.6	76.3	36.1	43.8	58.8	23.7	
Phi coefficient			.12	.09	.15	.21	.12	.19	

TABLE 19a--Continued

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES A-H	DEPENDENT VARIABLES 19-27								
	19. Emphasis on Word Study	20. Voluntary Reading about Teaching of Reading	21. Emphasis on Determining Author's Purpose	22. Emphasis on Evaluating in Light of Author's Purpose	23. Emphasis on Distinguishing Voice from Author	24. Emphasis on Relating Parts to Whole	25. Emphasis on Denotation and Connotation	26. Emphasis on Recognizing Tone	27. Emphasis on Vicarious Experience of Literature
A. Years of Experience			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
% in High Cell	76.6	54.9							53.7
% in Low Cell	57.7	31.6							44.5
Phi coefficient	.20	.225							.09
B. Major in College	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell		43.3			50.2				
% in Low Cell		54.0			40.3				
Phi coefficient		-.095			.09				
C. Graduate Degree						n.s.	n.s.		n.s.
% in High Cell	73.1	51.1	73.3	51.1	52.3			57.3	
% in Low Cell	66.5	42.1	66.7	42.4	43.8			47.0	
Phi coefficient	.07	.09	.07	.09	.085			.10	
D. Reading Course			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell	73.7	62.5					51.1		
% in Low Cell	67.2	36.8					42.0		
Phi coefficient	.07	.25					.09		
E. Reading Treated in Methods Course			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell	75.6	61.7							
% in Low Cell	67.5	40.8							
Phi coefficient	.08	.19							
F. Inservice Training	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
% in High Cell		55.1							55.3
% in Low Cell		41.9							47.8
Phi coefficient		.13							.075
G. Discussion in English Department			n.s.			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
% in High Cell	80.3	63.6		57.6	60.8				59.4
% in Low Cell	63.3	36.0		41.0	42.7				47.2
Phi coefficient	.15	.23		.135	.15				.10
H. Assistance to Teachers--General	n.s.		n.s.		n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	
% in High Cell		59.4		57.7		60.0			63.8
% in Low Cell		40.4		42.6		49.5			47.8
Phi coefficient		.16		.12		.09			.13

TABLE 19b: RELATION OF PREPARATION (INDEPENDENT VARIABLES I-O) TO PRACTICES AND SELF-RATINGS

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES I-O	DEPENDENT VARIABLES 1-9								
	1. Evaluation of Preparation	2. Attendance at Reading Conference	3. Meeting Needs of Average Student	4. Meeting Needs of Above-average	5. Meeting Needs of Below-average	6. Acceptance of Responsibility of High School for Reading	7. Responsibility Also for Developmental Reading	8. Frequency of Grouping for Reading	9. Emphasis on Increasing Speed in Reading
I. Assistance from Specialist--Individual				n.s.		n.s.			
% in High Cell	68.2	58.7	89.6		60.3		85.1	59.0	28.7
% in Low Cell	44.9	44.1	75.5		37.4		77.0	43.9	15.3
Phi coefficient	.18	.11	.13		.18		.07	.11	.135
J. Assistance from Specialist--Group						n.s.	n.s.		
% in High Cell	73.1	67.9	90.7	93.1	66.7			61.8	30.7
% in Low Cell	46.5	44.4	76.2	83.5	38.6			44.8	16.3
Phi coefficient	.15	.13	.10	.08	.17			.095	.11
K. Evaluation of Preparation						n.s.			
% in High Cell		63.8	93.1	91.6	60.6		81.3	58.6	27.5
% in Low Cell		29.1	62.4	76.7	21.7		75.5	34.1	7.1
Phi coefficient		.35	.37	.20	.395		.07	.25	.27
L. Acceptance of Responsibility of High School	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.			n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell		48.5					85.0		
% in Low Cell		34.6					47.8		
Phi coefficient		.11					.34		
M. Responsibility Also for Developmental Reading		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.				n.s.
% in High Cell	51.1					89.2		48.4	
% in Low Cell	42.6					57.1		39.5	
Phi coefficient	.07					.34		.07	
N. Senior or Junior High School	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	—	—	—	n.s.
% in High Cell		44.5							
% in Low Cell		53.2							
Phi coefficient		-.08							
O. Enrollment	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	—	—	—	n.s.
% in High Cell									
% in Low Cell									
Phi coefficient									

TABLE 19b--Continued

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES I-O	DEPENDENT VARIABLES 10-18								
	10. Teaching Unit on Newspapers and Periodicals	11. Teaching Unit on Propaganda and Advertising	12. Teaching Unit on Semantics	13. Teaching Unit on Critical Reading of Non-fiction	14. Teaching Unit on Study-type Reading	15. Use of Special Materials for Reading Instruction	16. Reading Not Taught Solely Through Literature	17. Use of Reading Interest Inventory	18. Use of Student Reading Record
I. Assistance from Specialist--Individual	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.					
% in High Cell					55.6	67.3	73.2	41.2	68.5
% in Low Cell					39.9	48.6	59.3	26.4	58.6
Phi coefficient					.12	.14	.11	.125	.08
J. Assistance from Specialist--Group	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.		n.s.		n.s.
% in High Cell			71.2			71.6		41.9	
% in Low Cell			57.1			49.8		27.7	
Phi coefficient			.08			.12		.09	
K. Evaluation of Preparation		n.s.							
% in High Cell	76.6		61.7	83.5	50.6	64.5	67.5	40.5	64.5
% in Low Cell	65.0		54.9	77.0	33.9	39.2	55.3	17.3	56.5
Phi coefficient	.13		.07	.08	.17	.25	.125	.26	.08
L. Acceptance of Responsibility of High School	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.		n.s.	
% in High Cell					44.5		63.1		62.2
% in Low Cell					31.7		53.3		53.1
Phi coefficient					.10		.08		.07
M. Responsibility Also for Developmental Reading	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
% in High Cell					44.9				62.4
% in Low Cell					32.2				53.9
Phi coefficient					.10				.07
N. Senior or Junior High School	n.s.		n.s.	—			n.s.	n.s.	
% in High Cell		63.4			36.6	46.8			56.8
% in Low Cell		53.3			52.0	62.2			68.1
Phi coefficient		.09			-.14	-.14			-.10
O. Enrollment	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	—	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell									
% in Low Cell									
Phi coefficient									

TABLE 19b--Continued

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES I-O	DEPENDENT VARIABLES 19-27								
	19. Emphasis on Word Study	20. Voluntary Reading about Teaching of Reading	21. Emphasis on Determining Author's Purpose	22. Emphasis on Evaluating in Light of Author's Purpose	23. Emphasis on Distinguishing Voice from Author	24. Emphasis on Relating Parts to Whole	25. Emphasis on Denotation and Connotation	26. Emphasis on Recognizing Tone	27. Emphasis on Vicarious Experience of Literature
I. Assistance from Specialist--Individual			n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell	76.8	55.6		57.8					
% in Low Cell	68.1	44.4		44.0					
Phi coefficient	.07	.085		.105					
J. Assistance from Specialist--Group	n.s.		n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		
% in High Cell		62.3		60.3				67.1	62.3
% in Low Cell		44.5		45.3				50.2	49.3
Phi coefficient		.10		.08				.10	.07
K. Evaluation of Preparation			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell	79.2	63.6							
% in Low Cell	60.3	29.2							
Phi coefficient	.21	.35							
L. Acceptance of Responsibility of High School	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell									
% in Low Cell									
Phi coefficient									
M. Responsibility Also for Developmental Reading	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
% in High Cell									
% in Low Cell									
Phi coefficient									
N. Senior or Junior High School	—	n.s.				—			n.s.
% in High Cell			76.7	53.0	54.0		50.7	61.0	
% in Low Cell			58.6	35.7	33.0		34.8	32.8	
Phi coefficient			.18	.15	.185		.14	.25	
O. Enrollment	—			n.s.		—	n.s.		n.s.
% in High Cell		42.8	75.1		49.5			57.2	
% in Low Cell		55.8	65.5		38.0			41.5	
Phi coefficient		-.10	.08		.09			.12	

The Phi coefficients of correlation were computed and are given in Tables 19a and 19b to facilitate rapid comparison of the strength of the relationships between the various pairs of factors. However, in themselves they are somewhat misleading, since Phi almost always somewhat underestimates the strength of relationships.[1] The best indication of the strength of relationship between each pair of variables in the tables will be derived from inspection of the pair of percentages in each case. In each pair, it is the size of the percentages relative to each other (i.e., the difference between the two, not their absolute size) that is important. The greater the difference between them, the stronger the relationship between the independent and dependent variables involved (and, of course, the higher will be the Phi). It is certainly true that the higher the Phi, the stronger the relationship involved; but even the highest Phi's to be found in the table, such as the .39 at the intersection D-1, Table 19a, do not seem very high. However, to take that particular case (D-1) as an example, the fact revealed by a comparison of the percentages is much more impressive than Phi alone would suggest: twice as many of the teachers who have had a course on the teaching of reading rate themselves as well prepared than do the teachers who have had no such course (75.2% of the former and 34.3% of the latter). Comparison of the percentages associated with even much lower Phi's also reveals stronger relationships than the Phi's alone would suggest. For example, the percentages at the intersection F-5 in the same table show that almost half (49.4%) of the teachers who indicated that some form of inservice training in the teaching of reading had taken place in their schools during the last five years rated themselves as meeting the needs of below-average students at least moderately well, while only about a third (33.5%) of those in whose schools there had been no such inservice training so rated themselves; yet the Phi in this case was only .16. The Phi coefficients are included in the tables, nonetheless, because they do expedite comparisons.

So that the relationships between, on the one hand, the various forms of preparation and, on the other, practices in teaching reading and self-rating of preparation and of effectiveness may be grasped more quickly, Tables 20 and 21 are presented. They are, in effect, summaries of Tables 19a and 19b. In the count of frequencies presented in the tables, independent variables N (Senior or Junior High School) and O (Enrollment) have not been included; as indicated earlier, those two variables are control variables rather than independent, or "cause," variables.[2]

---

[1] Guilford speaks of "the drastic limitations to the size of phi" and explains that "the reason for the reduced size of phi is that a 2 x 2 table places restrictions upon phi that do not affect r" (J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, Fourth Edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965), pp. 335-337). Peatman states that "the usefulness of having a correlation value is mainly for comparative purposes with other Phi coefficients but not with r's" (John G. Peatman, Introduction to Applied Statistics (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 136). The Phi coefficient is a statistic closely associated with Chi square and was the proper coefficient of correlation to use in the study, since the data could not be assumed to satisfy the conditions (continuity and normal distribution) required for the use of Spearman's r or for the tetrachoric correlation coefficient. (The latter, moreover, regularly overestimates relationships.)

[2] Discussion of these two variables will be presented later in the chapter.

Table 20 indicates the number of dependent variables with which each independent variable has statistically significant relationship, and also the strength of the relationship as indicated in each case by the size of the Phi coefficient. The independent variables are arranged in order from the most to the least important, as indicated both by the number and by the strength of significant relationships which each has with the dependent variables.

TABLE 20: NUMBER OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES WITH WHICH EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE HAS STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP AND STRENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP AS INDICATED BY PHI COEFFICIENT

Independent Variable	Number of Dependent Variables with Which Independent Variable Is Significantly Related	Number of Phi's .20 or Higher	Number of Phi's Between .15 and .20	Total Number of Phi's over .15
C. Discussion of Reading in English Department	19	9	3	12
K. Evaluation of Preparation	17	10	1	11
D. Reading Course	18	5	5	10
E. Reading in Methods Course	15	7	2	9
H. Assistance to Teachers--General	17	5	5	10
A. Years of Experience	12	4	1	5
F. Inservice Training--General	13	2	4	6
I. Assistance from Specialist--Individual	15	0	2	2
J. Assistance from Specialist--Group	14	0	2	2
K. Graduate Degree	14	0	1	1
B. Major in College (English or other)	5	0	0	0
L. Acceptance of High School Responsibility for Reading--General	5	1	0	1
M. Acceptance of High School Responsibility for Developmental Reading	5	1	0	1

Especially when it is considered that the maximum number of significant relationships possible in any one set of cross-tabulations was twenty-seven (the number of dependent variables), Table 20 makes unmistakably evident the fact that preparation for teaching reading does make an important difference--that the English teachers who are better prepared for the teaching of reading do in fact differ significantly in many respects from those who are less well prepared. Moreover, in view of the number of Phi's over .15, the differences are practically significant as well as statistically significant (it must be recalled that the Phi's regularly underestimate the strength of the relationships between the variables).[1]

It is notable that the variable, Discussion of Reading in English Department, heads this list (Table 20). The findings of the present study concerning the relation of this variable to the teaching of reading in the high school amply bear out Squire and Applebee's emphasis on the organization and operation of the English department, and on "interaction within the English faculty," as a "crucial variable" in the effectiveness of the English curriculum.[2]

The variable, Evaluation of Preparation, as noted previously, was used both as an independent and as a dependent variable. Just how it operates as the former cannot be known with certainty. It may be (and to some extent most likely is) that the teachers who consider themselves well prepared actually are so, and that the fact that they are better prepared both causes them to differ significantly from other teachers in their practices and justifies their rating themselves as better prepared for and more effective in their teaching of reading, as compared with those other teachers. But it is also possible that their considering themselves as well prepared is important chiefly for its psychological effect upon the teachers concerned: it may cause them to approach the teaching of reading with more confidence and to rate their effectiveness more favorably than would be objectively warranted. This latter consideration probably cannot be dismissed wholly; but when the variable of Evaluation of Preparation was used as a dependent variable, the number of significant relations which it was revealed to have with the variables pertaining to specific forms of preparation (cf. Tables 19a and 19b, and Tables 21 and 22)--a number of the relations of very considerable strength, it is evident that the teachers who rated themselves as well prepared had objective reasons for doing so.

Specific academic preparation (in courses) for teaching reading also ranks high on this list (Table 20). Variables D and E (Reading Course and Reading Treated to Considerable Extent in English Methods Course) appear to be almost equal in strength of their influence--i.e., in the differences that they make--and the findings of this study strongly support the opinion of the large majority of the teachers themselves (84.3%) that a course on the teaching of reading should be required of all prospective teachers of high school English. (For reasons not clear to the writer, the second of these two variables, having had a methods course in which the teaching of reading was treated to a considerable extent, has the highest Phi of all (.44) associated with it (see intersection E-1 in Table 19a), higher even than the corresponding Phi associated with a course devoted wholly to the teaching of reading.)

---

[1] The matter of the strength of the Phi coefficients will be discussed further at a later point.

[2] Squire and Applebee, op. cit., pp. 241, 73.

The variables other than Discussion of Reading in English Department that have to do with inservice training for the teaching of reading (variables H, F, and J) have a significant influence on many of the dependent variables but of considerably less strength than the Discussion in English Department variable.

Having a graduate degree (variable C) does seem to make some difference with respect to the teaching of reading; but it, too, is not especially strong in its influence, as is indicated by the fact that none of the Phi's associated with it reach as high even as .15.

A finding of the study presented earlier was that the large majority of English teachers agree with the statement that the high school is legitimately held responsible for reading instruction, developmental as well as remedial. It is interesting to note, however, that cross-tabulations of the two variables involved (L and M) with the dependent variables reveal that whether they verbally accept such responsibility or not makes for little practical difference. Apparently, even those teachers who are unwilling verbally to agree with the statement concerning such responsibility are nevertheless working to fulfill it--as much so, at least, as are those who agree with the statement.

An especially interesting finding of the study is with respect to independent variable B: whether or not one majored in English in college. As indicated in Tables 19a and 19b and in Table 20, this variable has few significant relationships with any of the dependent variables, and even those which are statistically significant are of such small magnitude as to have, probably, little if any practical significance. Moreover, four of the five statistically significant relationships are negative. Inspection of the responses to the pertinent question in the questionnaire (No. 9) and the nature of the particular dependent variables with which negative correlations obtain suggests a possible reason for the negative character of the relationships. The writer would hypothesize that at least three of the four dependent variables involved (attending reading conferences, voluntary reading about the teaching of reading, and teaching a unit on study-type reading) are activities of a sort in which non-English majors, especially Education majors, are more likely to be interested than are English majors. In any event, the non-English majors did in fact engage in them to a greater extent than did the English majors. That they did attend at least one reading conference during the last five years and do read more frequently about the teaching of reading may contribute in some degree to a somewhat larger percentage of them rating themselves as well prepared than of the English majors. On the other hand, the amount of stress placed on considerations of point of view in literary works in college classes for English majors may be reflected in the one statistically significant positive correlation for this variable: that with dependent variable No. 23, Emphasis on Distinguishing Voice from Author. However, since all of the differences involved are relatively small, all such speculations may be groundless.

Table 21 summarizes the data of Tables 19a and 19b in a fashion similar to that of Table 20 and yet quite different. That is, Table 21 presents the number of independent variables with which each dependent variable is significantly related (and also the strength of the relationships). Thus, the point of view is just opposite to that of the preceding table; and thus the table shows to what extent each of the twenty-seven individual dependent variables (the practices and the self-ratings of the teachers) is influenced by the independent variables (various kinds of preparation). The table does not, however, show by which particular independent variables the dependent variables are influenced. (Table 22 does show the most important of the specific relationships.)

TABLE 21: NUMBER OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES WITH WHICH EACH DEPENDENT VARIABLE HAS STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP AND STRENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP AS INDICATED BY PHI COEFFICIENT

Dependent Variable	Number of Independent Variables with Which Dependent Variable Is Significantly Related	Number of Phi's .20 or Higher	Number of Phi's Between .15 and .20	Total Number of Phi's over .15
1. Evaluation of Preparation	11	5	3	8
2. Attendance at Reading Conference	12	7	1	8
3. Meeting Needs of Average Student	9	4	1	5
4. Meeting Needs of Above-average	6	1	1	2
5. Meeting Needs of Below-average	9	4	4	8
6. Acceptance of High School Responsibility for Reading--General	3	1	0	1
7. Acceptance of High School Responsibility for Developmental Reading	4	1	0	1
8. Grouping for Reading Instruction	9	2	4	6
9. Emphasis on Reading Speed	9	4	2	6
10. Unit on Newspaper	5	0	0	0
11. Unit on Propaganda Analysis	2	0	0	0
12. Unit on Semantics	4	0	0	0
13. Unit on Critical Reading	6	0	0	0
14. Unit on Study-type Reading	10	1	2	3
15. Use of Special Materials in Reading Instruction	9	5	1	6

TABLE 21--Continued

Dependent Variable	Number of Independent Variables with Which Dependent Variable Is Significantly Related	Number of Phi's .20 or Higher	Number of Phi's Between .15 and .20	Total Number of Phi's over .15
16. Reading Not Taught Solely Through Literature	7	0	1	1
17. Use of Reading Interest Inventory	10	3	2	5
18. Use of Student Reading Record	7	0	0	0
19. Emphasis on Word Study	7	2	1	3
20. Voluntary Reading about Teaching Reading	11	4	2	6
21. Emphasis on Determining Author's Purpose	1	0	0	0
22. Emphasis on Evaluating in Light of Author's Purpose	5	0	0	0
23. Emphasis on Distinguishing Voice from Author	3	0	1	1
24. Emphasis on Relations of Parts	1	0	0	0
25. Emphasis on Denotation and Connotation	1	0	0	0
26. Emphasis on Recognizing Tone	2	0	0	0
27. Emphasis on Vicarious Experience of Literature	5	0	0	0

The most striking finding made plain by Table 21 is that two sets of teachers' practices in the teaching of reading--the teaching of the various "reading" units and, especially, the extent of emphasis on various aspects of teaching reading in the context of literature--are significantly related, on the whole, to only a minority of the thirteen independent variables (as was mentioned earlier, variables N and O were not included in the construction of Tables 20 and 21). Further, even the significant relationships which do obtain with respect to these variables are, with few exceptions, of quite small magnitude.

This finding is important, but it is necessary to stress precisely what the finding is and what it is not. It is that, with respect to most of the units and aspects in question, there are few significant differences in the extent to which they are taught or emphasized which depend on the independent variables investigated in this study by the means used in this study. The finding does not mean that the independent variables involved make little difference of any sort.[1] As has been emphasized, this study collected what might be called quantitative data rather than qualitative data. The teachers were asked simply whether or not they had taught the reading units and to what extent they attempted to develop the various understandings and reading abilities in the context of literature. They were not asked to rate their effectiveness with respect to either set of practices. Consequently, the study provides no evidence of the quality of the teaching of such units and such skills and understandings; no conclusions can be drawn from the study as to the relationship between that quality and the various factors pertaining to preparation for the teaching of reading. Why, for the most part, preparation of the kinds investigated in the study makes for so few differences with respect even to the extent to which the units are taught and attempts are made to develop the particular reading skills and understandings is also a question to which the data do not in themselves provide any answer.

One major exception to the general finding pertaining to the teaching of units is with respect to the unit on study-type reading. Other practices which are also significantly related (and with considerable strength) to at least a majority of the independent variables are: grouping for reading instruction, emphasis on increasing reading rate, use of reading interest inventories, emphasis on word study, and use of materials specifically designed for reading instruction. It seems likely that it is matters such as these that receive stress in courses on the teaching of reading, rather than the various skills and understandings of teaching reading in the context of literature.

Two other dependent variables which were found to be significantly related to many, in fact nearly all, of the independent variables were attendance at reading conferences and voluntary reading of books, articles, and research reports about the teaching of reading. (Each of these variables might have been used also as independent variables in the cross-tabulations, but neither was. They are both strongly related to the teachers' overall evaluation of their preparation, with almost identical percentages; and it is difficult to say in this case which is the "cause" and which the "effect.")

---

[1] Nor does the finding mean that such units are little taught or that those aspects are not stressed. See above, Chapter III.

Two of the three teachers' self-ratings of their effectiveness in meeting the reading needs of their students, especially the rating with respect to the below-average, are significantly related to most of the independent variables. The exception is with regard to meeting the needs of the above-average. It, too, is related significantly to a fair number of the independent variables; but since most of the total sample rated themselves favorably with respect to this aspect of the teaching of reading, it is not surprising that the number of significant differences is relatively small in this case.

A final table, Table 22, is a list of the specific independent and dependent variables which are most closely related, as indicated by the magnitude of the Phi coefficient associated with them. The table is, in effect, a more specific version of Tables 20 and 21 combined. The Phi's involved are useful for comparison; but even though they are the highest from Tables 19a and 19b, the caution is again in order that the corresponding percentages in each case should be checked.

The table repays close study. It confirms the generalization made evident by the preceding tables in this chapter: that the various forms of preparation do have statistically significant and practically important positive relationships with practices in the teaching of reading and with teachers' self-ratings of their effectiveness in such teaching.

TABLE 22: INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES MOST CLOSELY RELATED

Correlations with Phi's at .30 or Higher:

		Phi
D-1	Reading Course & Evaluation of Preparation	.39
D-2	Reading Course & Attendance at Reading Conference	.315
E-1	Reading in Methods Course & Evaluation of Preparation	.44
F-2	Inservice Training--General & Attendance at Reading Conference[1]	.35
H-5	Assistance to English Teachers--General & Meeting Needs of Average Students	.37
K-2	Evaluation of Preparation & Attendance at Reading Conference	.35
K-3	Evaluation of Preparation & Meeting Needs of Average Students	.37
K-5	Evaluation of Preparation & Meeting Needs of Below-average	.395
K-20	Evaluation of Preparation & Voluntary Reading About the Teaching of Reading	.35

Correlations with Phi's Between .25 and .30:

A-1	Years of Experience & Evaluation of Preparation	.26
D-20	Reading Course & Voluntary Reading About Teaching of Reading	.25
E-2	Reading in Methods Course & Attendance at Reading Conference	.285
E-17	Reading in Methods Course & Use of Reading Interest Inventory	.25
G-2	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Attendance at Reading Conference	.27
G-5	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Meeting Needs of Below-average	.27
G-15	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Use of Special Materials for Reading Instruction	.27
K-8	Evaluation of Preparation & Grouping for Reading	.25
K-9	Evaluation of Preparation & Emphasis on Speed	.27
K-15	Evaluation of Preparation & Use of Special Materials	.25
K-17	Evaluation of Preparation & Use of Reading Interest Inventory	.26

---

[1] It seems likely in this case that the "causal" relationship may have been mutual--that is, that Attendance at Reading Conference could also be considered an independent variable, one of the activities which teachers had in mind in marking the question about inservice training affirmatively.

TABLE 22--Continued

Correlations Between .20 and .25:		Phi
A-2	Experience & Attendance at Reading Conference	.21
A-19	Experience & Emphasis on Word Study	.20
A-20	Experience & Voluntary Reading About the Teaching of Reading	.225
D-3	Reading Course & Meeting Needs of Average Students	.20
D-14	Reading Course & Teaching Unit on Study-type Reading	.24
E-3	Reading in Methods Course & Meeting Needs of Average Student	.235
E-5	Reading in Methods Course & Meeting Needs of Below-average	.215
E-9	Reading in Methods Course & Emphasis on Reading Speed	.23
E-15	Reading in Methods Course & Use of Special Materials in Reading Instruction	.205
F-15	Inservice Training--General & Use of Special Materials in Reading Instruction	.23
G-1	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Evaluation of Preparation	.245
G-3	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Meeting Needs of Average Student	.23
G-8	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Grouping for Reading Instruction	.22
G-9	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Emphasis on Reading Speed	.245
G-17	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Use of Reading Interest Inventory	.22
G-20	Discussion of Reading in English Department & Voluntary Reading about Teaching of Reading	.23
H-1	Assistance to English Teacher--General & Evaluation of Preparation	.21
H-2	Assistance to English Teacher--General & Attendance at Reading Conference	.23
H-9	Assistance to English Teacher--General & Emphasis on Speed	.21
H-15	Assistance to English Teacher--General & Use of Special Materials for Reading Instruction	.20
K-4	Evaluation of Preparation & Meeting Needs of Average Student	.20
K-19	Evaluation of Preparation & Emphasis on Word Study	.21

Several points remain for brief discussion in this chapter. These points are the findings of the study with respect to the effect of variables N (Senior or Junior High School) and O (Enrollment), the results of cross-tabulations between pairs of variables when a third variable was held constant, and the matter of the size of the Phi coefficients.

As was stated earlier, variables N and O were not included in Tables 20, 21, and 22. The specific data pertinent to them are to be found in Table 19b. To speak first of variable O, this study found few differences between large and small schools with respect to the matters discussed in this chapter. The four significant differences that were found were quite small; one was in favor of the small schools, and three in favor of the large. Ten significant differences were found between senior and junior high schools (variable N). Four are in favor of the junior high schools: teaching unit on study-type reading, use of special materials for reading instruction, use of student reading record, and attendance by the teachers at reading conferences. Of the six differences in favor of the senior high, it is interesting that five of them are with respect to the teaching of reading through literature--a set of practices which, generally speaking, were found not to be greatly influenced by the independent variables. Since the reading skills and understandings in question are of a relatively mature sort, it is not surprising that in these cases the percentages are higher for the senior high school teachers than for the junior.

It was necessary to investigate the possibility that the apparent relationships between some of the pairs of variables may have been accountable largely to the relationship of both members of the pair to some third variable. For example, the apparent influence of having had a course on reading on the teachers' evaluation of their preparation may be confounded with the influence of a third variable, such as years of experience; the fact that the teachers who have been teaching more years tend to rate their preparation higher than those who do not (the Phi is .26) may account in large part for the apparent relationship between evaluation and having had a course in reading. To check against such possibilities, a series of cross-tabulations was held of independent variables D and E (Reading Course and Reading in English Methods Course) against all of the dependent variables, while variables A and C (Years of Experience and Graduate Degree) were held constant. The percentages and Phi's thus obtained did differ somewhat, of course, from those obtained from the cross-tabulations in which the latter variables were not held constant. Only in the case of the quite low Phi's, however, did the new cross-tabulations ever change a previously statistically significant difference to a non-significant one; and in general the Phi's were not greatly changed. The writer also performed a number of partial correlation calculations, with the same result. For example, a Phi of .39 was reduced to .37 when the effect of experience was partialed out from the relationship in question; one of .19 was reduced to .178 in another partial correlation operation. Since the relationships found in the earlier cross-tabulations did thus seem to hold up well in general, no further cross-breaks or partial correlations were conducted.

The final point to be discussed in this chapter is the general question of the size of the Phi coefficients found in the study. As has already been explained, they are somewhat misleading inasmuch as they consistently underestimate the strength of relationships. Still, even in the light of that consideration, it is undeniable that many of the Phi's found in Tables 19a and 19b are quite unimpressive, though significant, and the differences between percentages in the same cases are not very large. This fact--that is, that in many instances the teachers who have been better prepared and those who have been less prepared do not differ very much in respect to the teaching of reading--may be due in part to the nature of the sample in the present study. That sample, it will be recalled, was drawn from the secondary school section membership of the National Council of Teachers of English. Membership in that organization does not, of course, automatically confer upon the initiates any kind of special character of instant superiority in teaching; but it seems at least probable that as a whole NCTE members would be somewhat more professional than non-members in their attitudes and practices in teaching. They receive, and probably considerable numbers of them more or less regularly read, the NCTE's periodical for secondary school English teachers, The English Journal, in which articles on the teaching of reading appear frequently. Too, as noted in the first chapter of this report, the Continuing Education study found that NCTE members differ from non-members in several respects: NCTE members more frequently attend meetings of English teachers at local, state, and national levels; and a considerably larger percentage of them than of non-members (52.9% and 37.6% respectively) rated the reading of professional books and periodicals as "of greatest help." In the present study, 45.9% of the sample indicated that they rather frequently "voluntarily read articles or books concerning reading instruction and reports of research on reading," and an additional 38.2% said that they do so occasionally.

There seems, then, reason to believe that NCTE members who have not received much in the way of preparation for the teaching of reading through courses and in-service programs may, to an appreciable degree, compensate for that lack through their individual, self-initiated efforts, and this to a greater extent than do non-NCTE members. Consequently, the writer suggests, the differences in practices and self-ratings found in the sample between the teachers who had had and the teachers who had not had the various specific forms of preparation are at least somewhat less than they would have been in a study in which the sample included teachers who were not members of NCTE as well as teachers who were. If the foregoing reasoning is correct, in such a study the difference in the percentages in the "High" and "Low" cells would be larger (and so, consequently, would be the Phi's). The evidence concerning the value of the various forms of preparation would have been even more impressive than that of the present study.

The soundness of the suggested hypothesis can be tested, of course, only through further research. Meanwhile, the data presented in the present chapter provide striking evidence that the practices in teaching reading and the self-ratings of English teachers who have been better prepared for such teaching do differ in a very considerable number of important respects from those of English teachers who have been less well prepared--that the former engage in various desirable practices to a considerably greater extent than the latter and that considerably more of them believe themselves to be reasonably effective in such practices.

V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The instrument used in this study was a long one, and the analysis of the data presented in the two preceding chapters has been correspondingly long and detailed. Many of the detailed findings are important. Few of them will be repeated here, however, since they have been sufficiently presented and discussed in those chapters. Moreover, they should not be allowed to obscure or scatter the impact of the general, overall conclusions. The present chapter, therefore, will be brief.

Conclusions

The data collected in the study impressively confirm the findings of previous nation-wide studies and also extend them to a considerable degree. They make unmistakably clear and forceful the answers to the five basic questions which the study investigated:

1. The large majority of the English teachers in the sample agree with the statement that the high school should play a major role in the teaching of reading, both remedial and developmental; and their practices make plain that their acceptance of that responsibility is not merely verbal.[1] (See page 21.)

2. Though most of the teachers are striving to fulfill that responsibility, their preparation, preservice and inservice, for the teaching of reading is sorely inadequate. The majority consider themselves poorly prepared, and only a small percentage consider themselves well prepared. Few actually had a course on the teaching of reading on the undergraduate level, and in most schools the English teachers receive little if any inservice training for reading instruction. (See pages 22-23.)

3. Preparation of high school teachers of English for the teaching of reading has not been increased or improved during recent years, despite the urgent recommendations for improvement made by various authoritative organizations, especially the National Council of Teachers of English. (See pages 24-27.)

---

[1] Because the sample was representative of secondary school teachers of English who are members of the National Council of Teachers of English, this particular finding can be generalized only to that population. Whether the majority of public high school English teachers as a whole accept the responsibility in question cannot be determined from this study. The writer believes that the four other findings presented in generalized form at this point, and the detailed findings presented in Chapters III and IV, are much more generally applicable to public high school English teachers as a whole than is this first one.

4. Despite the great deficiencies in programs preparing English teachers to teach reading in the high school, numerous teachers are engaging in recommended practices in reading instruction. The present study provides no objective evidence, however, as to their effectiveness in such practices. The teachers believe themselves to be least effective in meeting the needs for reading instruction of the below-average student in their own classes and most effective in meeting the needs of the above-average. The majority of teachers in schools which have systematically planned remedial reading programs rate those programs as fair at best. The majority of the sample allot the same rating to developmental reading instruction in English classes as a whole in their schools. (See page 27, ff.)

5. Preparation does make a considerable difference. Differences which are practically important as well as statistically significant do in fact obtain between the practices and the self-ratings of effectiveness of the English teachers who have been better prepared (i.e., who have received courses in the teaching of reading and have had various forms of inservice training) and those of the teachers who have been less well prepared. The former group of teachers engage in such practices to a considerably greater extent and rate their effectiveness more favorably.

The implications of these findings appear to be immediately evident (so much so as almost to render unnecessary their being made explicit). However, the implications which the writer has in mind do rest on certain assumptions--assumptions which most of the teachers in the study appear to question as little as does the writer. The basic assumption is, of course, that the high school does in fact have a greatly important role to play in reading instruction. A further assumption is that, as at present, it is the teacher of English who will for the foreseeable future be expected to assume the greatest share in fulfilling that responsibility of the high school.

Stated briefly and bluntly, the general implication of the findings is simply this: High school English teachers are expected to teach reading. They are poorly prepared to do so. They should be well prepared.

Specific Recommendations

Like the general conclusion, the recommendations of the study will be kept deliberately few, lest the overall impact of the findings be scattered.

Recommendations With Respect to Teacher Preparation

1. That colleges and universities which prepare students to teach high school English require of all of them a course on the teaching of reading. In her report of a study conducted approximately ten years ago, Ruth Strang comments that "the bottleneck has been, and still is, in the schools of education and teachers' colleges. These institutions have failed to meet the need by offering adequate courses and supervised practice."[1] The findings of the present study make clear that the bottleneck *still* is at that point. It must be broken.

---

[1] Ruth Strang, "Preparation for the Teachers of Reading," *Journal of Developmental Reading*, IV (Autumn, 1960), p. 53.

2. That the students preparing to teach English in high school take a course on the teaching of reading if it is available, even though it is not required.

3. That English methods courses generally and especially courses on the teaching of reading emphasize the distinction made by Squire and Applebee between teaching literature and teaching the reading of literature, and that prospective teachers of English be prepared for the latter task as well as for the former.

4. That inservice training programs for the teaching of reading be initiated and/or improved in all high schools, and especially that members of English departments actualize to a much greater degree the potentialities inherent in departmental planning and discussion of the reading program in English classrooms.

5. That, to the extent that their other duties permit, reading specialists in high schools make available to English teachers the valuable assistance they are capable of giving to help the latter to teach reading more effectively.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. That a nation-wide study be undertaken with the same purposes as the present one, but in which the sample is drawn from all of the public high school English teachers of the country, not only from the secondary school section of the National Council of Teachers of English.

2. That an intensive study be undertaken, including classroom observation, interview of teachers and students, and use of appropriate measures of student achievement in reading, to further investigate the differential effects of various kinds and degrees of preparation for reading instruction. Desirably, such a study would include experimental and control groups. The experimental variable would be the kinds and degrees of preparation; the dependent variable would be their effect both upon teacher practices and student achievement in reading. The chief addition of such a study to the present one would be that it could obtain data of a more qualitative nature. It need not be a nation-wide study; it could be much more easily managed in the setting of a few schools at the local level, but its findings would be widely applicable if proper controls were maintained.

Concluding Word

To the writer, the brightest aspect of the findings of the study was that so many teachers appear to be conscientiously trying to fulfill a duty for which most have been poorly prepared. There were no open-ended questions in the questionnaire, so that the teachers could make no comments. Had opportunity for such comments been provided, it seems likely that many would have been of the same kind as those made by the high school English teachers of Illinois, in the study alluded to earlier. Crisp reports that the teachers in that study commented more, perhaps, concerning knowledge of ways to teach reading in the English classroom than concerning any other area of English instruction, and that "by far, the majority of the comments were pleas for help."[1]

For far too long such pleas have gone largely unheeded.

---

[1] Crisp, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, Mary C. "Professional Training of Reading Personnel," *Innovation and Change in Reading Instruction*. Sixty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 357-396.

______________., Coleman Morrison, and others. *The Torch Lighters: Tomorrow's Teachers of Reading*. Cambridge: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1961.

Bamman, Henry A., Ursula Hogan, and Charles E. Greene. *Reading Instruction in the Secondary School*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1961.

Committee on National Interest. *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

______________________________. *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961.

Crisp, Raymond D. *The Professional Competency of Illinois Secondary School English Teachers*. Washington: Bureau of Research, United States Office of Education, 1968.

Digest of Educational Statistics, 1968 Edition. Washington: United States Office of Education.

Early, Margaret J. "About Successful Reading Programs," *English Journal*, XLVI (October, 1957), pp. 395-405.

________________. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal about Successful Reading Programs?" *English Journal*, LVIII (April, 1969), pp. 354-547.

Evans, William H., and Michael J. Cardone. *Specialized Courses in Methods of Teaching English*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

Fader, Daniel N., and Morton H. Shaevitz. *Hooked on Books*. Berkley Medallion Book. New York: Berkley Publishing Corporation, 1966.

Guilford, J. P. *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Fourth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Hook, J. N. "Characteristics of Award-Winning High Schools," *English Journal*, L (January, 1961), pp. 9-15.

Karlin, Robert. "Nature and Scope of Developmental Reading in Secondary Schools," in Mildred A. Dawson (comp.), *Developing High School Reading Programs*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1967, pp. 6-9.

______________. *Teaching Reading in High School*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964.

Marksheffel, Ned D. *Better Reading in the Secondary School: Principles and Procedures for Teachers*. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1966.

Massey, Will J., and Virginia D. Moore. *Helping High School Students to Read Better*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Oppenheim, A. N. *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Peatman, John G. *Introduction to Applied Statistics*. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Reading Instruction in Secondary Schools. Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, Vol. XX, No. 1. Washington: Research Division of the NEA, 1942.

Simmons, John S. "The Scope of the Reading Program for Secondary Schools," *Reading Teacher*, XVII (September, 1963), pp. 31-35.

Simpson, Elizabeth A. *Helping High-School Students Read Better*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1954.

Squire, James R. and Roger K. Applebee. *High School English Instruction Today: The National Study of High School English Programs*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Strang, Ruth. "Preparation for the Teachers of Reading," *Journal of Developmental Reading*, IV (Autumn, 1960), pp. 53-57.

____________. "Teaching Reading, An Essential Part of Teaching English," in M. Jerry Weiss (ed.), *Reading in the Secondary School*. New York: Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961, pp. 351-357.

Summers, Edward G. *An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Research Related to Reading in the Secondary School: 1900-1960*. (Preliminary Draft.) Pittsburgh: School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1963.

Witty, Paul, and William Brink. "Remedial Reading Practices in the Secondary School," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XI (April, 1949), pp. 193-205.

APPENDIX A:

The Questionnaire

The following is a copy of the questionnaire used in the study. The figures in parentheses after each response item are percentages which indicate the proportion of respondents who answered the particular question in a certain way (i.e., by marking A, B, C, D, or E). The percentages have been rounded off to two decimal places.

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SAINT XAVIER COLLEGE STUDY OF READING INSTRUCTION BY HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

This questionnaire is to be answered anonymously. Do *NOT* write your name on the answer sheet. At the top of the sheet write in only the date, and (in the space for NAME) the term, *Reading Survey*. In the space for SCHOOL, write *Public*, *Parochial*, or *Private*, as appropriate.

Your answers are to be marked on the answer sheet, not on the questionnaire itself. The answer sheet should be marked with a No. 2 pencil (*not* with ink or colored pencil).

NOTE WELL: The answer sheet items are numbered *across* the sheet in rows of four items each. Thus items 1 to 4 are in the top row, items 5 to 8 in the second row, etc.... Please be sure to mark the proper corresponding number. Avoid resting the point of your pencil on the answer sheet while you are considering your answers. If you make an error in marking, be sure to erase the incorrect mark *completely*.

Please answer *every* question, leaving no omissions. For each question, only *one* answer space should be blackened. The machine-scoring is programmed to handle no more than one answer per question. (For this reason, in some cases it has been necessary to spread over two or more questions what is really only one central point, such as socio-economic class.)

1. Which grades are included in the school in which you teach?

   A. 7-12 (13.19%)
   B. 7-9 or 7-8 (21.06%)
   C. 9-12 (33.59%)
   D. 10-12 (25.06%)
   E. Some other grade organization (7.10%)

2. What is the enrollment in your school?

   A. Under 200 (3.18%)
   B. 200-499 (10.21%)
   C. 500-999 (28.21%)
   D. 1000-1999 (38.31%)
   E. Over 2000 (20.09%)

3. In what kind of area is your school located? (Use your own judgment for first four groups.)

   A. Rural (10.32%)
   B. Suburban (23.16%)
   C. Small town (23.60%)
   D. Large town (13.06%)
   E. City (for uniformity, anything over 60,000) (29.86%)

4. If your answer to the last question was *City*, what is its approximate population?

   A. Not a city (67.55%)
   B. 60,000-150,000 (10.97%)
   C. 150,000-300,000 (5.43%)
   D. 300,000-500,000 (4.50%)
   E. Over 500,000 (11.55%)

Questions 5 and 6: In which geographical region of the United States is the school in which you teach located? (Use your own judgment as to which states are included in the various regions.)

5. A. The East (26.73%)
   B. The South (20.47%)
   C. The Southwest (11.86%)
   D. The North-Central States (21.25%)
   E. None of these (mark this if answer is given in No. 6) (19.62%)

6. A. The Mid-Western States (e.g., the Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri) (12.84%)
   B. The Mountain States (3.41%)
   C. The Far Western States (6.70%)
   D. None of these (mark this if answer is given in No. 5) (70.34%)

7. How many years of experience in teaching have you had, including the current year?

A. 1 year (2.96%)
B. 2 or 3 years (17.23%)
C. 4-6 years (16.58%)
D. 7-10 years (16.25%)
E. More than 10 years (46.98%)

8. Which one of the following best represents the amount of schooling which you have had?

A. Less than Bachelor's degree (0.11%)
B. Bachelor's degree (13.27%)
C. Bachelor's degree plus some graduate work (42.65%)
D. Master's degree (20.07%)
E. Beyond Master's degree (23.90%)

9. In which subject did you major in college?

A. English (73.60%)
B. Speech and/or Drama (4.18%)
C. Journalism (1.32%)
D. Education (7.70%)
E. Subject other than A, B, C, or D (13.20%)

10. In which subject did you minor in college?

A. English (21.94%)
B. Speech and/or Drama (7.72%)
C. Journalism (0.88%)
D. Education (17.20%)
E. Subject other than A, B, C, or D (52.26%)

11. In which subject, if any, do you have a graduate degree?

A. No graduate degree (52.88%)
B. English (23.12%)
C. Speech, Drama, or Journalism (2.43%)
D. Education (17.59%)
E. Subject other than B, C, or D (3.98%)

12. If you have no graduate degree but have taken some graduate courses, in which subject chiefly have they been? (Please remember that an answer is to be marked for every question.)

A. Have graduate degree (43.42%)
B. Have taken no graduate courses (11.94%)
C. English (27.23%)
D. Education (10.04%)
E. Subject other than C or D (7.37%)

13. How well prepared, on the whole, do you consider yourself to be for giving instruction in reading at the high school level?

A. Very well prepared (4.97%)
B. Well prepared (14.14%)
C. Fairly well prepared (30.06%)
D. Rather poorly prepared (29.94%)
E. Very poorly prepared (20.88%)

14. Have you ever taken any course devoted wholly or chiefly to the teaching of reading at the high school level?

A. No (63.63%)
B. Yes, a course (or courses) at the undergraduate level (11.21%)
C. Yes, a course (or courses) at the graduate level (19.89%)
D. Yes, both B and C (5.27%)

15. Was a course on the teaching of reading required at your college for students preparing to teach high school English?

A. Yes (8.77%)
B. No (81.80%)
C. Am not certain (9.32%)

16. Do you believe a course specifically on the teaching of reading should be required in the training program of all students preparing to teach high school English?

A. Yes (84.30%)
B. No (6.81%)
C. Undecided (8.56%)

17. Have you ever taken any course specifically on the teaching of English at the high school level?

A. No (20.11%)
B. Yes, a course (or courses) at the undergraduate level (44.20%)
C. Yes, a course (or courses) at the graduate level (14.70%)
D. Yes, both B and C (20.77%)

18. If you have had such a course on the teaching of English, to what extent did it include specific treatment of the teaching of reading at the high school level? (If you had no such course, blacken space D for this question.)

A. To considerable extent (5.60%)
B. To fair extent (16.70%)
C. To little or no extent (52.42%)
D. Had no such course (25.05%)

19. How recently have you had any course specifically on the teaching of reading at the high school level?

A. Never (58.51%)
B. 1 to 5 years ago (27.44%)
C. 5 to 10 years ago (8.01%)
D. 10 to 15 years ago (3.18%)
E. Over 15 years ago (2.85%)

20. How recently have you attended any conference specifically devoted in whole or in considerable part to problems of teaching reading at the high school level?

A. Never (52.30%)
B. 1 to 3 years (37.72%)
C. 3 to 6 years ago (7.68%)
D. 6 to 10 years ago (1.54%)
E. Over 10 years ago (0.77%)

21. Has any form of inservice training in the teaching of reading been given to the English teachers in your school during the last five years?

A. Yes (38.72%)
B. No (45.21%)
C. Do not know (15.73%)

Questions 22-24: Have any of the following specific forms of inservice training in the teaching of reading been given to the English teachers in your school during the last five years? (Please remember that each question is to be answered.)

22. Demonstration(s) by reading specialist?

A. Yes (32.93%)
B. No (48.57%)
C. Do not know (18.50%)

23. Lecture(s) by or discussion(s) with reading specialist?

A. Yes (40.70%)
B. No (42.02%)
C. Do not know (17.27%)

24. Teachers' work-shop or institute?

A. Yes (30.69%)
B. No (51.16%)
C. Do not know (18.15%)

25. How frequently are meetings of the English department held in your school?

A. Never (6.74%)
B. Once or twice a year (9.50%)
C. Three or four times a year (12.60%)
D. Five or six times a year (15.03%)
E. More or less monthly, or more frequently (56.13%)

26. In meetings of the English department, how frequently is there pre-planned and systematic discussion of the reading program of the school?

A. Frequently enough to justify considering reading one of the major concerns of the English department (14.36%)
B. Occasionally, but not so frequently as in A (28.07%)
C. Rarely or never (43.97%)
D. English department meets so infrequently that this point is not very meaningful (11.18%)
E. Do not know (2.41%)

27. How frequently is assistance given to individual English teachers in your school to help them in their teaching of reading (assistance given by reading specialist, curriculum director, head of English department, and/or other such persons)?

    A. Such assistance is regular and important part of program (15.26%)
    B. Such assistance is only occasional (23.27%)
    C. Such assistance is given rarely or never (53.46%)
    D. Am not certain (7.79%)

28. Is a description of the instruction in reading in the English program of your school written down in some form, such as a teacher's guide, course of study, syllabus, etc.?

    A. Yes (38.61%)
    B. No (52.48%)
    C. Do not know (8.47%)

29. In your opinion, how thoroughly developed and properly sequential is the written description of the reading program?

    A. There is no such written description (46.25%)
    B. It is generally quite good (14.68%)
    C. It is generally fairly good (16.34%)
    D. It is poor (9.49%)
    E. Do not know (13.25%)

Questions 30 and 31: In your school, who has or has had the major responsibility for planning reading instruction in the English program?

30. A. The curriculum department, or some similar agency, in the central office of the school system (21.66%)
    B. The English department as a whole in the school itself (11.16%)
    C. The individual English teachers in the school (29.17%)
    D. The chairman of the English department (6.30%)
    E. None of these (mark this if answer is given in No. 31) (31.71%)

31. Responsibility for planning reading instruction (continued):

    A. Reading specialist(s) in the school (31.09%)
    B. Curriculum director(s) in the school (6.28%)
    C. Superintendent, principal, or assistant principal (4.85%)
    D. None of these (mark this if answer is given in No. 30) (45.87%)
    E. Do not know for certain (11.91%)

Questions 32-34: In your opinion, how effectively does the actual reading instruction by the English teachers as a whole in your school (supplemented by reading specialists) meet the needs of the students in the school?

32. How effectively does it meet the needs of the students with average ability and achievement?

    A. Very well (6.82%)
    B. Moderately well (49.28%)
    C. Poorly (28.93%)
    D. Do not know the program as a whole well enough to judge (14.85%)

33. How effectively does it meet the needs of students with above-average ability and achievement?

    A. Very well (18.16%)
    B. Moderately well (44.41%)
    C. Poorly (22.81%)
    D. Do not know the program as a whole well enough to judge (14.51%)

34. How effectively does it meet the needs of students with below-average ability and achievement?

    A. Very well (10.66%)
    B. Moderately well (28.02%)
    C. Poorly (48.68%)
    D. Do not know the program as a whole well enough to judge (12.42%)

Questions 35-37: How effectively, in your own evaluation of yourself, do you meet the needs for reading instruction of the students you teach?

35. The needs of the average student?

A. Very well (9.77%)
B. Moderately well (60.92%)
C. Poorly (20.20%)
D. Does not apply (9.00%)

36. The needs of the above-average student?

A. Very well (23.79%)
B. Moderately well (49.89%)
C. Poorly (13.71%)
D. Does not apply (12.39%)

37. The needs of the below-average student?

A. Very well (6.41%)
B. Moderately well (28.40%)
C. Poorly (49.61%)
D. Does not apply (15.25%)

38. With which one of the following two statements do you more closely agree?

A. If the elementary school properly fulfilled its responsibility for teaching reading, there would be little need for reading instruction in the high school. (17.69%)

B. Even though the elementary school properly fulfilled its responsibility for teaching reading, there would still be a major need for reading instruction in the high school. (82.31%)

39. With which one of the following statements do you more closely agree?

A. The major need in reading instruction at the high school level is to give remedial instruction to those students who have not attained their proper grade-level standard in reading. (21.56%)

B. Remedial instruction in reading is certainly a major need, but an equally important need is to give instruction in more advanced reading skills to students who have attained their proper grade-level standard in reading. (78.33%)

40. Are standardized reading tests given to all students upon (or soon after) entry into the first year of your school (or are scores on such tests available, for students entering the first year, from some source other than their being tested by the school itself)?

A. Yes (70.99%)
B. No (16.92%)
C. Do not know (11.98%)

41. Aside from testing upon entry, how frequently are standardized reading tests given to all students in the school?

A. Never (20.38%)
B. Annually (20.60%)
C. Two more times (14.62%)
D. One more time (17.39%)
E. Do not know (27.02%)

42. Are scores on standardized reading tests made available to English teachers for the students whom they teach?

A. No (4.40%)
B. Yes, routinely (38.02%)
C. Yes, but only upon request (43.74%)
D. Do not know (5.16%)
E. No such tests are given (8.68%)

43. Approximately what percent of the students entering the first year of the school are two or more grades below their proper grade level in reading? (If possible, please base your answers to this and the following question on standardized test scores. If that is not possible, use your best judgment.)

A. 15% or fewer (19.75%)
B. 16%-25% (37.72%)
C. 26%-40% (28.35%)
D. 41%-60% (10.49%)
E. Over 60% (3.68%)

44. At what grade level does the average entering first-year student in your school read?

A. At or above proper grade level (46.64%)
B. 1-2 years below grade level (44.51%)
C. 3-4 years below (7.74%)
D. 5-6 years below (1.12%)
E. More than 6 years below (0.00%)

Questions 45 and 46: Which one of the following socio-economic class groupings best represents that of the majority of students in your school?

45. A. Mostly lower class (10.06%)
B. Mostly middle class (33.97%)
C. Mostly upper class (3.58%)
D. Mixture of A and B (31.84%)
E. None of these (mark this if answer is given in No. 46) (20.56%)

46. Socio-economic class (continued): (Please do not omit this question.)

A. Mixture of middle and upper class (11.80%)
B. Mixture of lower and upper class (3.31%)
C. Mixture of all three classes (24.59%)
D. None of these (mark this if answer is given in No. 45) (58.99%)

47. To what extent is it true of your school that it has a systematically planned program in remedial reading for students who are below their grade-level norms in reading skills?

A. To very considerable extent (12.29%)
B. To considerable extent (22.06%)
C. To fair extent only (29.64%)
D. To little or no extent (33.04%)
E. Do not know well enough to judge (2.96%)

48. What evaluation would you give personally of the remedial reading program for first-year students in your school?

A. Excellent (6.27%)
B. Good (22.33%)
C. Fair (24.53%)
D. Poor (20.57%)
E. Do not know (or have no remedial program) (26.29%)

49. What would be your personal evaluation of the remedial reading program for students above the first year in the school?

A. Excellent (3.32%)
B. Good (14.82%)
C. Fair (25.22%)
D. Poor (22.68%)
E. Do not know (or have no remedial program above first-year level) (33.96%)

50. How many reading specialists (that is, persons hired specifically for their expertness in the field of teaching reading) are included on the faculty of your school?

A. None (42.02%)
B. One (37.40%)
C. Two or three (17.16%)
D. Four or five (2.31%)
E. More than five (1.10%)

Questions 51-54 concern the role of the reading specialist(s) in your school. To what extent is he (she or they) responsible for and involved in the following activities? (If the faculty includes no reading specialist, please mark answer space E for Questions 51 through 54.)

51. Teaches special remedial reading classes:

A. To great extent (27.08%)
B. To moderate extent (19.63%)
C. To little or no extent (9.21%)
D. Do not know (1.86%)
E. Faculty does not include reading specialist (42.21%)

52. Gives individual instruction to students below level in reading:

A. To great extent (18.70%)
B. To moderate extent (24.86%)
C. To little or no extent (10.23%)
D. Do not know (4.51%)
E. Faculty does not include reading specialist (41.69%)

53. Provides assistance to individual English teachers to help them improve their teaching of reading:

A. To great extent (4.42%)
B. To moderate extent (12.60%)
C. To little or no extent (38.34%)
D. Do not know (2.65%)
E. Faculty does not include reading specialist (41.99%)

54. Provides assistance to English teachers in group sessions to help them improve their teaching of reading:

A. To great extent (1.10%)
B. To moderate extent (7.46%)
C. To little or no extent (47.42%)
D. Do not know (2.09%)
E. Faculty does not include reading specialist (41.93%)

55. To what extent are the English teachers as a whole responsible for and involved in the remedial reading program in your school?

A. To great extent (9.22%)
B. To moderate extent (18.99%)
C. To little or no extent (46.98%)
D. Do not know (2.20%)
E. School has no remedial reading program (22.61%)

56. Does the school have separate, special classes for remedial instruction in reading?

A. Yes (59.60%)
B. No (37.98%)
C. Do not know (2.20%)

57. In which years, if any, are they given?

A. In freshman year (or first year of school, whatever grade it may be) only (14.78%)
B. In the first year and one or more other years (44.33%)
C. Not in any year (35.33%)
D. Do not know (5.11%)

58. Are students in English classes in the first year of the school divided into ability groups; and, if so, are such ability groupings based, at least in part, on students' scores on standardized reading tests?

A. There are no such ability groupings (21.51%)
B. There are such ability groupings, and they are based at least in part on standardized reading test scores (54.01%)
C. There are such groupings, but they are not based on such test scores (14.27%)
D. There are such groupings, but I do not know basis of grouping (9.00%)
E. Do not know whether there are such groupings (1.21%)

59. Do you yourself group students in your English classes in any way for instruction in reading?

A. Never (29.93%)
B. Rarely (17.21%)
C. Occasionally (29.28%)
D. Regularly (11.40%)
E. Does not apply (12.17%)

60. If you do so group students, on what chiefly do you base your groupings?

A. Intelligence test scores (0.33%)
B. Scores on standardized reading tests (3.63%)
C. My personal judgment (22.88%)
D. Combination of two or more of A, B, and C (30.58%)
E. Does not apply (42.57%)

61. Does the school have any requirement of a minimal grade-level score in reading that must be attained before students are allowed to pass from the first to the second year of the school (or from first term to second--i.e., quarter, semester, trimester)?

A. Yes (2.43%)
B. No (89.38%)
C. Do not know (7.74%)

62. Does the school have any such requirement for any of the higher grade (year or term) levels?

A. Yes (3.18%)
B. No (88.27%)
C. Do not know (8.44%)

63. What would be your personal evaluation of the reading program in English classes for developing more advanced skills in students not in need of remedial instruction?

A. Excellent (4.29%)
B. Good (25.93%)
C. Fair (29.34%)
D. Poor (27.69%)
E. Do not know program as a whole well enough to judge (12.75%)

Questions 64 through 79 are concerned with the teaching of various kinds of units (or similar groupings of learning activities, yearly sequences, or matters more or less continually emphasized) as part of the reading program:

64. In the English program as a whole at your school, are one or more units (or similar grouping of learning activities) included on the reading of newspapers and/or periodicals?

A. Yes (63.16%)
B. No (25.22%)
C. Do not know (11.18%)

65. Have you yourself taught a unit (or similar grouping of learning activities) on the reading of newspapers and/or periodicals one or more times during the last five years?

A. Yes (69.60%)
B. No (29.06%)
C. Does not apply (1.34%)

66. Does the English program at your school include one or more units on propaganda analysis and/or the study of advertisements?

A. Yes (52.75%)
B. No (35.27%)
C. Do not know (11.65%)

67. Have you yourself taught such a unit during the last five years?

A. Yes (57.85%)
B. No (38.64%)
C. Does not apply (3.51%)

68. Does the English program at the school include one or more units on semantics?

A. Yes (53.40%)
B. No (36.07%)
C. Do not know (10.53%)

69. Have you yourself taught such a unit during the last five years?

A. Yes (55.91%)
B. No (40.33%)
C. Does not apply (3.43%)

70. Does the English program include one or more units on critical reading of non-fiction prose (other than the unit(s) on the newspaper and/or periodicals)?

A. Yes (79.82%)
B. No (13.16%)
C. Do not know (6.91%)

71. Have you yourself taught such a unit during the last five years?

A. Yes (78.62%)
B. No (19.63%)
C. Does not apply (1.75%)

72. Does the English program include a specific unit on a method of reading for the purpose of studying--such as the Survey Q3R method?

A. Yes (35.09%)
B. No (48.03%)
C. Do not know (16.89%)

73. Have you yourself taught such a unit during the last five years?

A. Yes (39.34%)
B. No (53.59%)
C. Does not apply (6.85%)

74. To what extent does the English program of the school emphasize word study (e.g., study of roots, prefixes, suffixes; etymology; etc.)?

A. To great extent (16.03%)
B. To considerable extent (37.21%)
C. To fair extent only (33.70%)
D. To little or no extent (9.33%)
E. Do not know program as a whole well enough to judge (3.73%)

75. To what extent in your own English classes do you emphasize word study?

A. To great extent (26.21%)
B. To considerable extent (42.65%)
C. To fair extent only (25.55%)
D. To little or no extent (4.50%)
E. Does not apply (1.10%)

76. To what extent does the English program as a whole emphasize the expansion of pupils' vocabularies?

A. To great extent (25.77%)
B. To considerable extent (48.03%)
C. To fair extent only (20.50%)
D. To little or no extent (2.63%)
E. Do not know program as a whole well enough to judge (3.07%)

77. To what extent in your own English classes do you deliberately and systematically attempt to expand your pupils' vocabularies?

A. To great extent (39.18%)
B. To considerable extent (46.17%)
C. To fair extent only (12.54%)
D. To little or no extent (1.22%)
E. Does not apply (0.89%)

78. To what extent in the reading program of the school is use made of materials and/or devices especially designed to increase the reading rate of students?

A. To great extent (8.23%)
B. To considerable extent (20.53%)
C. To fair extent only (29.53%)
D. To little or no extent (31.50%)
E. Do not know (10.21%)

79. In your classes, to what extent do you use such materials and devices to increase your students' speed in reading?

A. To great extent (3.25%)
B. To considerable extent (12.44%)
C. To fair extent only (24.23%)
D. To little or no extent (50.11%)
E. Does not apply (9.69%)

80. Is specific instruction in the use of the library included in the first year English program?

A. Yes (93.85%)
B. No (3.85%)
C. Do not know (2.09%)

81. If such instruction is included, by whom is it given?

A. It is not included (3.48%)
B. It is usually given by the librarian(s) (32.36%)
C. It is usually given by the English teacher(s) (17.75%)
D. It is usually given by both (45.17%)
E. Do not know (1.24%)

82. In your classes, do you use any texts or other materials specifically designed for the development of reading skills? (In answering this question, please do not include literature texts in your consideration.)

A. Never (27.00%)
B. Rarely (18.99%)
C. Occasionally (27.22%)
D. Regularly (21.95%)
E. Does not apply (4.83%)

83. Are reading laboratory materials (such as the SRA, Webster, Scott Foresman, etc.) used in your school by the teachers of English?

A. No (26.07%)
B. Used by small minority of teachers of English (50.50%)
C. Used by many teachers of English (16.83%)
D. Do not know (6.38%)

84. To what extent is it true of your own teaching that it is in your teaching of literature (poetry, fiction, drama, and literary essay) that you teach reading skills?

A. It is almost wholly in the teaching of literature that I teach such skills. (36.55%)
B. I teach reading skills chiefly in my teaching of literature, but to some extent I teach them also through units (or similar groupings of learning activities, sequences, etc.) on critical reading of non-fiction prose, reading the newspaper, propaganda analysis, etc. (43.69%)
C. In teaching reading skills I use the non-literature components (i.e., such units as those mentioned in B) and the literature components about evenly. (9.66%)
D. In teaching reading skills I use the non-literature components somewhat more than the literature components. (4.83%)
E. Does not apply (5.27%)

Questions 85-87: Please use the following code in answering the next three questions, which are concerned with the extent to which you personally use certain types of materials or devices in your teaching.

A - If you use the particular type of material or device frequently or regularly
B - If you use it or them fairly often but not regularly
C - If you have used it or them a few times only
D - If you have never used it or them
E - If the question does not apply

85. Administering reading inventories to your students to determine their reading interests:

A. 11.92%
B. 15.70%
C. 28.73%
D. 39.42%
E. 4.23%

86. Using paper-back books as part of your program in reading (e.g., keeping classroom library of paper-backs, distributing lists of good paper-backs, etc.):

A. 66.19%
B. 18.66%
C. 9.22%
D. 4.39%
E. 1.54%

87. Requiring students to keep "reading records"--lists of books which they have read voluntarily over period of time:

A. 44.90%
B. 14.49%
C. 17.56%
D. 21.19%
E. 1.87%

88. Which of the following descriptions most accurately describes you?

A. I rather frequently voluntarily read articles or books concerning reading instruction and reports of research on reading. (45.93%)
B. I voluntarily read about such matters only occasionally. (38.24%)
C. Only rarely do I voluntarily read about such matters. (12.97%)
D. I never voluntarily read about such matters. (2.09%)
E. Does not apply (0.77%)

Questions 89-100 are concerned with various aspects of reading involved in the study of literature. To what extent in your teaching of literature do you deliberately and systematically attempt to develop the following abilities and/or understandings? In marking your answers, regard the letters from A to D as a four-point scale, with A high (meaning to a high, or great, extent) and D low (meaning to little or no extent). Mark the letter E for questions which you think are not pertinent to your teaching.

89. Ability to determine the author's purpose in the work as a whole and in various parts of the work:

A. 68.54%
B. 24.06%
C. 4.75%
D. 1.21%
E. 1.43%

90. Understanding that a work should be evaluated in the light of the author's purpose, and that he should not be adversely criticized for not doing what he in fact had not intended to do:

A. 44.49%
B. 30.51%
C. 15.53%
D. 5.18%
E. 4.30%

91. Understanding that the sentiments, beliefs, and attitudes expressed by the supposed speakers or writers and other characters in a piece of literature are not necessarily the actual sentiments, etc., of the author himself:

A. 46.48%
B. 33.41%
C. 13.52%
D. 3.96%
E. 2.64%

92. Ability to relate the various parts of a literary work to one another:

A. 51.21%
B. 34.18%
C. 10.88%
D. 1.76%
E. 1.98%

93. Ability to detect theme in works appropriate to the particular grade level:

A. 70.77%
B. 21.76%
C. 5.93%
D. 0.66%
E. 0.88%

94. Understanding of the difference between the theme of a work and a moral lesson:

A. 47.97%
B. 30.74%
C. 16.25%
D. 3.29%
E. 1.76%

95. Ability to distinguish between the denotation and the connotation of words in particular contexts:

A. 44.68%
B. 33.92%
C. 16.79%
D. 3.29%
E. 1.32%

96. Recognition and proper interpretation of figurative language:

A. 55.78%
B. 32.23%
C. 9.35%
D. 1.32%
E. 1.32%

97. Ability to recognize the tone (e.g., ironic) of a literary work:

A. 50.94%
B. 33.89%
C. 10.85%
D. 2.66%
E. 1.66%

98. Ability to project oneself imaginatively into the work and to participate vicariously in the experiences and feelings of characters in stories, plays, and poems:

A. 49.72%
B. 36.19%
C. 11.22%
D. 1.65%
E. 1.21%

99. Ability to understand the syntax of sentences in poetry:

A. 27.83%
B. 35.09%
C. 25.63%
D. 8.25%
E. 3.19%

100. Ability and disposition to listen for the sound of poetry, even in one's own "silent" reading:

A. 38.69%
B. 36.47%
C. 18.18%
D. 4.66%
E. 2.00%

PLEASE CHECK TO SEE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS,
AND ALSO THAT YOU HAVE NOT MARKED MORE THAN ONE ANSWER PER QUESTION.

PLEASE CHECK ALSO TO BE SURE THAT YOU HAVE WRITTEN IN
Public, *Parochial*, or *Private* IN THE SPACE FOR SCHOOL
AT THE TOP OF THE ANSWER SHEET.

APPENDIX B:

Grouping of Responses for Use in Cross-Tabulations

GROUPING OF RESPONSES OF QUESTIONS USED IN CROSS TABULATIONS (2 x 2 CONTINGENCY TABLES)

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

A. Question 7 (Years of Experience)--combined responses A, B, and C (less than 7 years) vs. combined D and E (7 years or more).

B. Question 9 (Major in College)--A (English) vs. combined B, C, D, and E (other subjects).

C. Question 11 (Graduate Degree)--A (no graduate degree) vs. combined B, C, D, and E (graduate degree in various subjects).

D. Question 14 (Course on Teaching of Reading)--A (did not have course) vs. combined B, C, and D (had course at undergraduate level or graduate level or both).

E. Question 18 (Extent to Which Teaching of Reading Was Treated in English Methods Course)--combined A and B (to considerable or fair extent) vs. C (to little or no extent). D (had no such course) omitted.

F. Question 21 (Inservice Training)--A (Yes) vs. B (No). C (do not know) omitted.

G. Question 26 (Extent to Which Teaching of Reading Is Discussed in Meetings of English Department)--A (to considerable extent) vs. combined C and D (to little or no extent). B (occasionally) and E (do not know) omitted.

H. Question 27 (Frequency of Assistance to Individual English Teacher)--A (regularly) vs. C (rarely or never). B (only occasionally) and D (am not certain) omitted.

I. Question 53 (Assistance from Reading Specialist to Individual English Teacher--combined A and B (to great or moderate extent) vs. combined C (to little or no extent) and E (no reading specialist in school).

J. Question 54 (Assistance from Specialist in Group Sessions)--combinations as in preceding _I_.

K. Question 13 (Evaluation of Preparation)--combined A, B, and C (Very well, Well, and Fairly well prepared) vs. combined D and E (Rather poorly and Very poorly prepared).

L. Question 38 (Acceptance of High School's Responsibility for Reading)--A (in effect, does not accept) vs. B (does accept).

M. Question 39 (Acceptance of High School's Responsibility for Developmental Reading)--as in preceding _L_.

N. Question 1 (Senior or Junior High School)--B (junior high) vs. combined C (9-12) and D (10-12). A (7-12) and E (other grade organization) omitted.

O. Question 2 (Enrollment, or Size of School)--combined A and B (under 200-499) vs. combined D and E (1000 or more). C (500-999) omitted.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

1. Question 13 (Evaluation of Preparation)--combinations as when used as independent variable K.

2. Question 20 (Recency of Attendance at Reading Conference)--combined A (never) and E (over 10 years ago) vs. combined B and C (1 to 3 and 3 to 6 years ago). D (6 to 10 years ago) omitted.

3. Question 35 (Meeting Needs of Average Student)--combined A and B (Very well and Moderately well) vs. C (Poorly). D (Does not apply) omitted.

4. Question 36 (Meeting Needs of Above-average)--as in No. 3.

5. Question 37 (Meeting Needs of Below-average)--as in No. 3.

6. Question 38 (Acceptance of High School's Responsibility for Reading)--combinations as when used as independent variable L.

7. Question 39 (Acceptance of High School's Responsibility for Developmental Reading)--combinations as when used as independent variable M.

8. Question 59 (Grouping for Reading Instruction)--combined A and B (never or rarely) vs. combined C and D (occasionally or regularly). E (Does not apply) omitted.

9. Question 79 (Extent of Emphasis on Increasing Reading Speed)--combined A and B (to great or considerable extent) vs. combined C and D (to fair or to little or no extent). E (Does not apply) omitted.

10. Question 65 (Teaching Unit on Newspapers and Periodicals)--A (Yes) vs. B (No). C (Does not apply) omitted.

11. Question 67 (Unit on Propaganda Analysis)--as in No. 10.

12. Question 69 (Unit on Semantics)--as in No. 10.

13. Question 71 (Unit on Critical Reading)--as in No. 10.

14. Question 73 (Unit on Study-type Reading)--as in No. 10.

15. Question 82 (Frequency of Use of Special Materials)--combined A and B (never or rarely) vs. combined C and D (occasionally or regularly). E (Does not apply) omitted.

16. Question 84 (Extent to Which Reading Is Taught in Context of Literature)--A (almost wholly) vs. B, C, and D (to lesser extent). E (Does not apply) omitted.

17. Question 85 (Frequency of Use of Reading Interest Inventory)--combined A and B (regularly or fairly often) vs. combined C and D (rarely or never). E (Does not apply) omitted.

18. Question 87 (Use of Student Reading Record)--as in No. 17.

19. Question 75 (Emphasis on Word Study)--as in No. 9.

20. Question 88 (Frequency of Voluntary Reading about Teaching of Reading)--A (rather frequently) vs. B, C, and D (occasionally, rarely, or never). E (Does not apply) omitted.

21-27: Questions 89, 90, 91, 92, 95, 97, and 98 (Extent of attempt to develop certain reading skills in context of literature)--A (to great extent) vs. combined B, C, and D (to lesser extent). E (not pertinent to respondent's teaching) omitted.